

Gender-based violence

# The costs of gender-based violence in the European Union







# The costs of gender-based violence in the European Union

# Acknowledgements

This report was prepared by ICF Consulting Services Ltd in close cooperation with European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE) staff, including Agata Szypulska, Cristina Fabre Rosell, Jurgita Pečiūrienė, Ligia Nobrega and Adine Samadi. The main authors of this report were Maleeha Kisat, Simona de Paolis, Elbereth Puts and Katerina Mantouvalou (ICF Consulting Services Ltd). The

independent experts who contributed to this report were Ioana Borza and Dr Philippa Olive.

Many thanks to other colleagues for their intellectual contributions and administrative support.

EIGE would especially like to thank Dr Elizabeth Villagomez-Morales, who contributed to the quality assurance of this study.

## European Institute for Gender Equality

The European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE) is an autonomous body of the European Union established to strengthen gender equality across the EU. Equality between women and men is a fundamental value of the EU and EIGE's task is to make this a reality in Europe and beyond. This includes becoming a European knowledge centre on gender equality issues, supporting gender mainstreaming in all EU and Member State policies, and fighting discrimination based on sex.

European Institute for Gender Equality, EIGE  
Gedimino pr. 16  
LT-01103 Vilnius  
LITHUANIA

Tel. +370 52157444

Email: [eige.sec@eige.europa.eu](mailto:eige.sec@eige.europa.eu)

 <http://www.eige.europa.eu>

 <http://twitter.com/eurogender>

 <http://www.facebook.com/eige.europa.eu>

 <http://www.youtube.com/eurogender>

 <http://eurogender.eige.europa.eu>

 <https://www.linkedin.com/company/eige/>

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2021

Print ISBN 978-92-9482-920-7 doi:10.2839/23187 MH-09-21-238-EN-C

PDF ISBN 978-92-9482-921-4 doi:10.2839/063244 MH-09-21-238-EN-N

© European Institute for Gender Equality, 2021

Photo credit: © NateeMeepian/Shutterstock.com

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged.

Reuse is authorised provided the source is acknowledged, the original meaning is not distorted and EIGE is not liable for any damage caused by that use. The reuse policy of EIGE is implemented by Commission Decision of 12 December 2011 on the reuse of Commission documents (2011/833/EU).

---

# Abbreviations

<b>CSEW</b>	Crime Survey for England and Wales
<b>EIGE</b>	European Institute for Gender Equality
<b>GREVIO</b>	Group of Experts on Action against Violence against Women and Domestic Violence
<b>LAA</b>	Legal Aid Agency
<b>MHCLG</b>	Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Governance
<b>NGO</b>	non-governmental organisation
<b>OECD</b>	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
<b>ONS</b>	Office for National Statistics

# Contents

<b>Abbreviations</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Executive summary</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>7</b>
1.1. Structure of this report	7
<b>2. Estimating the costs of gender-based violence in the EU – UK case study</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1. Methodology	8
2.2. UK case study	11
2.3. Extrapolation to EU Member States	22
2.4. Conclusions	24
<b>3. Methodologies for estimating the costs of gender-based violence and violence against women and men – critical review</b>	<b>25</b>
3.1. Methodology of the literature search	25
3.2. Overview of the selected studies	28
3.3. Comparison of methodologies for estimating the costs of gender-based violence or violence against women and men	29
3.4. Strengths and limitations of the selected studies	42
3.5. Reflections and lessons learned	43
<b>References</b>	<b>50</b>

# Executive summary

Gender-based violence is one of the most severe forms of gender inequality and it remains one of the most pervasive human rights violations, affecting women disproportionately. Gender-based violence not only causes pain and suffering to the victims, but also places large costs on the economy and society as a whole. However, the extent and associated costs of gender-based violence, encompassing lost economic output, public spending on health, legal, social and specialised services to mitigate harms, and personal impacts on victims, are rarely seen.

In this context, this study provides updated estimates of the costs of gender-based and intimate partner violence in the European Union. These updated estimates are based on the 2014 European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE) report entitled *Estimating the costs of gender-based violence in the European Union*. The method used to calculate these costs involved calculating estimates for the United Kingdom and extrapolating the results to EU Member States. The United Kingdom was chosen as a case study as relevant information was available to calculate these costs.

Because of the absence of comprehensive data for comparable cost estimates, the final estimates were extrapolated to EU Member States by adjusting the total costs of gender-based and intimate partner violence to the relative population size of the United Kingdom and each Member State. The method of extrapolating costs from the United Kingdom based on population sizes alone has some limitations and these should be considered when interpreting the cost estimates. Potential differences in survey-based prevalence and reporting rates in crime surveys or police data across Member States as well as differences in service costs and expenditure data need to be taken into account.

Extrapolating the UK case study results to the EU by adjusting the estimates to the population size of each EU Member State, the estimated cost of gender-based violence against women in the EU-27 was more than EUR 290 billion <sup>(1)</sup>, representing 79 % of all costs of gender-based violence against both women and men. The estimated cost of intimate partner violence against women in the EU-27 was nearly EUR 152 billion <sup>(2)</sup>, representing 87 % of all costs of intimate partner violence against both women and men.

As well as the cost estimates, this report provides a critical assessment of studies carried out within the EU to estimate the costs of gender-based and intimate partner violence that have been published since EIGE's 2014 study. Based on an in-depth assessment of the costing methodologies applied in recent literature, this review provides a set of lessons learned for future costing studies at European level, as well as recommendations for estimating the costs of gender-based violence at Member State and EU levels.

The review noted that gender-based violence is a complex problem that can affect the lives of the victims, those close to them and society as a whole, both directly and indirectly, making it particularly difficult to capture the full extent of the effects of violence in costing studies. Therefore, careful conceptualisation is required to fully understand the landscape of the agents involved (individuals and organisations), as well as the costs they incur.

The review also highlighted the need to strengthen national and EU data collection on the extent of gender-based violence and its costs and the use of services as a result of gender-based violence, including comprehensive administrative data from public services and population surveys. Because of cultural and institutional factors such as barriers to re-

<sup>(1)</sup> The full estimated cost of gender-based violence against women in the EU was EUR 290 309 795 927.

<sup>(2)</sup> The full estimated cost of intimate partner violence against women in the EU was EUR 151 950 791 341.

porting, the use of a range of values or different data sources is recommended to address uncertainties in the extent of gender-based violence in a country. For example, uncertainties can be addressed through the use of confidence intervals, by using both prevalence and incidence data and multiple sources of data. Moreover, it is recommended that sensitivity analyses are carried out to assess the robustness of the methodology used in order to quantify how uncertainties regarding different inputs can impact final cost estimates. In addition, following up on existing cost estimates of gender-based vio-

lence can further advance policymaking. The examples provided in this report can also support policymakers and relevant institutions in their efforts to combat gender-based violence and assess the gaps between service use and the budgets allocated to gender-based violence policies, measures and service provision. They can also be used to develop a macroeconomic model for measuring total output gains or losses to the economy and to monitor the evolution of service provision and the extent of gender-based violence to inform future costing studies.

# 1. Introduction

Gender-based violence is a widespread phenomenon in the European Union, affecting women disproportionately – in 2012, one in three women aged 15 or over experienced physical and/or sexual violence <sup>(3)</sup>. Although a price cannot be put on women’s lives and suffering, estimating the lost economic output and public spending on health, legal, social and specialised services with regard to gender-based violence can create a better understanding of the extent and associated costs of this phenomenon. Attaching a monetary value to the issue can also further support both Member States and the EU in making informed decisions regarding resource allocation across different policy areas (EIGE, 2014). Analysis of the economic costs of gender-based violence may also show the cost of inaction and lack of financial prioritisation.

Acknowledging the importance of preventing and combating gender-based violence in the EU, this study estimates the costs of gender-based violence, using existing methodology from the European Institute for Gender Equality’s (EIGE) 2014 study entitled *Estimating the costs of gender-based violence in the European Union* (EIGE, 2014). As in the previous study, this report focuses on intimate partner violence as a subset of gender-based violence. Intimate partner violence is defined by the Council of Europe as ‘all acts of physical, sexual, psychological or economic violence between former or current spouses or partners, whether or not the per-

petrator shares or has shared the same residence with the victim’ <sup>(4)</sup>. The broader category of gender-based violence additionally includes violence from other family and household members and forms of gender-based violence that are perpetrated by non-intimate partners and non-household members (EIGE, 2014). This broader category of violence against women is defined by the UN as ‘any act of gender-based violence that results in, or is likely to result in, physical, sexual or psychological harm or suffering to women, including threats of such acts, coercion or arbitrary deprivation of liberty, whether occurring in public or in private life’ <sup>(5)</sup>.

## 1.1. Structure of this report

This report focuses on updating estimates of the costs of gender-based and intimate partner violence in the United Kingdom in 2019. These estimates are then extrapolated from the United Kingdom to EU Member States. This updated study on the costs of gender-based violence in the EU is accompanied by a critical review of studies carried out within the EU to estimate the costs of gender-based and intimate partner violence that have been published since EIGE’s 2014 study. This review provides a set of lessons learned for future costing studies at European level and recommendations for estimating the costs of gender-based violence at Member State and EU levels.

<sup>(3)</sup> <https://fra.europa.eu/en/data-and-maps/violence-against-women-survey/survey-information>

<sup>(4)</sup> <https://www.coe.int/en/web/conventions/full-list/-/conventions/treaty/210>

<sup>(5)</sup> <https://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/ViolenceAgainstWomen.aspx>

## 2. Estimating the costs of gender-based violence in the EU – UK case study

### 2.1. Methodology

Following EIGE's 2014 study, the UK case study adheres to Home Office methodology to measure the costs of crime, including lost economic output, utilisation of the health system and criminal justice system and physical and emotional impacts on victims. In 2018, the Home Office published the second edition of *The Economic and Social Costs of Crime* (Heeks et al., 2018), which provides updated estimates for the 'unit costs' of crime. To obtain updated cost estimates of gender-based and intimate partner violence for the United Kingdom, the unit cost of crime obtained from the Home Office report was adjusted for inflation to reflect 2019 prices, converted from pounds sterling to euro based on the mid-2019 conversion rate and then multiplied by the number of incidents of crime under each type of crime category. Information on the incidence of crime was primarily derived from the 2019/2020 Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW) <sup>(6)</sup> and homicide statistics <sup>(7)</sup> for England and Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland.

In addition to the Home Office methodology, other types of costs that are known to be related to gender-based and intimate partner violence were measured by applying the methodologies used in EIGE's 2014 study. These

costs include those related to police time spent on 'no-crime incidents' <sup>(8)</sup> and utilisation of the civil justice system, social welfare system and specialised services, and personal costs. These cost estimates were derived from additional data sources including legal aid statistics, family court statistics, local authority expenditures and Office for National Statistics (ONS) divorce statistics.

The methodology presented here describes the key aspects of the approach used to obtain the cost estimates for the United Kingdom and extrapolate them to EU Member States. A comprehensive account, including the step-by-step approach used and details of data limitations, is provided in a separate technical report.

#### 2.1.1. Updates to the methodology used in the UK case study

Relevant to this case study, the main update to the Home Office methodology was the availability of the unit cost of crime by crime classification. In EIGE's 2014 study, unit costs of violent incidents were available from the Home Office for the following crime classifications: homicide, wounding, common assault and sexual violence. At the time of the present case study, the CSEW collected data on violent crime using a differ-

<sup>(6)</sup> <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/crimeandjustice/bulletins/crimeinenglandandwales/yearending-march2020>

<sup>(7)</sup> England and Wales homicide data, Tables 11a and 11b (<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/crimeandjustice/datasets/appendix1tableshomicideinenglandandwales>); Scotland homicide data, Table 8 (<https://www.gov.scot/publications/homicide-scotland-2019-2020/pages/3/#:~:text=The%20number%20of%20homicide%20cases,which%20comparable%20data%20are%20available>); Northern Ireland homicide data, 'Domestic abuse annual trends', Table 3.9 (<https://www.psni.police.uk/inside-psni/Statistics/domestic-abuse-statistics/>).

<sup>(8)</sup> 'No crime' is a category of police work that covers cases in which the police have been called to respond to an incident and the incident is deemed not to meet the legal threshold for a criminal offence. In England and Wales, there were more than 1 million calls to the police in 2012/2013 for domestic abuse-related incidents and only 269 700 incidents were recorded as domestic violence-related crimes (HMIC, 2014). These data show that 'no-crime incidents' make up a substantial component of police activity (and it is also important to note that many events are probably misclassified) (EIGE, 2014).

ent set of classifications. Corresponding to the updates to crime classifications in the CSEW, the 2018 edition of the Home Office methodology provided unit costs subdivided by the following crime classifications: homicide, violence with injury, violence without injury, rape and other sexual offences.

The methodologies applied to estimate the costs of the utilisation of the civil justice system, self-funded legal costs and the costs of homelessness prevention (previously sanctuary schemes) were updated based on the availability of data and examination of the current policy context in the United Kingdom. These changes are detailed in the technical report.

### 2.1.2. Data updates in the UK case study

This case study used a combination of updated survey data on victims of crime and cost estimates based on administrative data from the same statistical sources as in EIGE's 2014 study where available; alternative data sources with more recent or complete data where appropriate; and old indicators where appropriate alternative data sources were not available. All costs were adjusted for inflation to 2019 levels in accordance with the 2014 methodology. Moreover, in accordance with the 2014 methodology, if the required data were not available for the United Kingdom, data for the cost estimates were extrapolated to the United Kingdom using multipliers based on relative population sizes (e.g. from England and Wales to the United Kingdom). The method for extrapolating costs to the United Kingdom based on population sizes alone has some limitations, which should be considered when interpreting the cost estimates. Because of the devolution of health and social care services and justice and policing in the United Kingdom <sup>(9)</sup>, public service systems and expenditures may vary across England,

Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland. When data from England and Wales are extrapolated to the United Kingdom using a population-based multiplier, the cost estimates might be biased towards costs in England and Wales as the calculations do not account for potential differences in costs of service provision between England and Wales and the rest of the United Kingdom.

The most significant change from the 2014 methodology concerns the incidence data. The previous study relied on microdata from the CSEW, whereas this update relies on publicly available information published by the ONS. Often, this published information did not include the required breakdown of the data (e.g. by sex, by victim–perpetrator relationship). Therefore, we used auxiliary information to make assumptions about the data and adjusted estimates based on these assumptions. The main assumptions are as follows and are discussed in detail in the technical report.

1. Published crime statistics from the CSEW provide estimates of the number of victims of crime rather than the number of incidents of crime. In order to follow the methodology used in EIGE's 2014 study and the Home Office methodology, transformation of the data was required to estimate the number of incidents of crime using victim-based data. This was carried out by using information on the proportion of victims of domestic violence who said they were victims once (one incident: 66 % of victims), two to four times (a median of three incidents: 27 % of victims) or five or more times ((at least) five incidents: 7 % of victims) <sup>(10)</sup>. The number of victims was then scaled up by this information to estimate the number of incidents. A limitation of this approach is that it does not distinguish between men and women victims of repeat violence but assumes the same rate for both. It also assumes that the same rates apply for

<sup>(9)</sup> [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/770709/DevolutionFactsheet.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/770709/DevolutionFactsheet.pdf)

<sup>(10)</sup> Table D7 for year ending March 2020 in 'Crime in England and Wales: Annual trend and demographic tables' (<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/crimeandjustice/datasets/crimeinenglandandwalesannualtrendanddemographictables>).

victims of domestic violence and victims of intimate partner violence.

2. No survey data were available on rape by victim's gender regardless of the victim's relationship to the perpetrator (although data on police-recorded crimes were available). This study used information on rape by domestic partners from the CSEW (domestic abuse module) and applied a multiplier obtained from police administrative data on the proportion of rapes that are reported in a domestic abuse context to scale up the number of victims of rape. The limitation of this approach is that this attribution relies on recorded offences and does not consider instances in which offences are not recorded (e.g. women and men may be less likely to report instances of domestic rape, or domestic rape overall may be reported less frequently).
3. No data were available on violence with injury and violence without injury by relationship to the perpetrator although these data were available by gender of the victim. The CSEW data were disaggregated into intimate partner and domestic violence using multipliers obtained from police administrative data on the proportions of violent incidents recorded by relationship to the perpetrator, without disaggregation by sex. A limitation of this approach is that the sex of the victims was not considered; rather, the same proportions for domestic and intimate partner violence were applied to women and men. In addition, the police data on recorded crime do not include data from Greater Manchester Police and therefore they underestimate recorded crimes in England and Wales.

### 2.1.3. Extrapolation to EU Member States

To extrapolate the costs of gender-based and intimate partner violence in the United Kingdom in 2019 to EU Member States, the total

costs of gender-based and intimate partner violence (themselves extrapolated from England and Wales for some of the data) were adjusted to the relative population sizes of the United Kingdom and each Member State, in accordance with the 2014 methodology. For example, the population of Belgium was estimated to be around 17.1 % of the population of the United Kingdom in 2019; therefore, the total costs of gender-based violence and intimate partner violence in the United Kingdom were multiplied by 0.171 to extrapolate them to Belgium.

Extrapolation was applied because of the absence of comprehensive data providing comparable cost estimates. However, there are several limitations to this approach, which should be considered when interpreting the cost estimates in EU Member States.

Extrapolation does not consider potential differences in survey-based prevalence rates across Member States, which means that the cost estimates do not capture if some Member States have a higher prevalence of gender-based and intimate partner violence than others.

Reporting rates for gender-based and intimate partner violence in crime surveys and police data may vary between countries depending on awareness of the issue and institutional and cultural barriers to reporting. Extrapolation does not quantify potential differences in reporting rates and how such differences may affect the cost estimates for EU Member States. Similarly, the inability to access microdata from the CSEW restricted the analysis to publicly available data from the ONS. To estimate the numbers of incidents of gender-based and intimate partner violence, this study used data on the prevalence of gender-based violence in England and Wales in the year ending March 2020. Given that one person can be a victim more than once, prevalence is not sufficient to estimate the costs of gender-based and intimate partner violence, especially in the case of the latter, where repeated incidents tend to be the

norm. Because of these limitations, this study transformed the available prevalence data to numbers of incidents using estimates from the CSEW on the percentages of the sample who reported that they had been victimised once, two to four times or five or more times. However, this is likely to underestimate the actual numbers of incidents, given that the victimisation rates were capped at five for respondents who reported that they were victimised five or more times.

Moreover, this extrapolation relies on UK service costs and expenditure data and therefore does not capture differences between countries based on the type, availability and use of services. Public service systems and government expenditure vary across EU Member States depending on factors such as the utilisation of services, levels of decentralisation, legal duty to provide financial assistance, for example in the case of homelessness (Baptista and Marlier, 2019), and the types of services available. The level of government expenditure is also likely to influence the average cost of utilising a service for a victim of gender-based or intimate partner violence.

Another important limitation of the present study relates to the reliance on existing research to estimate the proportion of expenditure in the overall population resulting from intimate partner violence. In particular, some of the cost estimates (civil legal costs and child welfare costs) relied on Walby's (2004) estimates on the proportion of divorces resulting from intimate partner violence and on the co-occurrence of child abuse/negligence and domestic violence. These multipliers were estimated using data from 2001 or earlier. As such, using these multipliers in the present study meant relying on the assumption that trends in the pattern of divorces attributable to intimate partner violence and in the co-occurrence of child abuse/negligence and domestic violence were unchanged. Finally, assumptions were made about what to include and what not to include in some of the categories associated with intimate partner violence based on the available data. For example, in the case of child welfare expenditure, to estimate the proportion of children in need because of intimate partner violence, this study relied on the number of children referred because of 'abuse or neglect'. The technical report of this study details the methodological choices and assumptions made for each cost estimate.

## 2.2. UK case study

This section presents the results for each type of cost followed by a summary of the results. The types of costs included broadly cover lost economic output, costs of public services, and the physical and emotional impacts on victims.

### 2.2.1. Lost economic output

Violence has an impact on the ability of victims to perform work. According to the 2018 Home Office report on the economic and social costs

of crime (Heeks et al., 2018), this manifests in both the victim's productivity on the job and the time taken off work as a consequence of crime. To calculate the lost economic output costs of gender-based and intimate partner violence, this study used the unit cost estimates from Heeks et al. (2018). This report uses 2015/2016 data on crime in England and Wales to quantify the effect of lost economic output per crime category. Unit costs from Heeks et al. (2018) were adjusted to 2019 prices and the costs of gender-based and intimate partner violence against women and men were derived by multiplying the unit costs by the number of incidents by crime category, type of violence and gender (Table 1).

**Table 1. Lost economic output costs of gender-based and intimate partner violence, United Kingdom, 2019**

Gender-based violence (GBV)						
Crime category	2019 unit cost (EUR)	No of incidents women	No of incidents men	Cost women (EUR)	Cost men (EUR)	Total cost (EUR)
Homicide	321 944	98	47	31 549 429	15 130 849	46 680 278
Violence with injury	2 604	588 423	193 277	1 532 061 837	503 230 356	2 035 292 193
Violence without injury	847	797 449	210 764	675 300 630	178 480 457	853 781 087
Rape	7 457	376 514	68 176	2 807 712 112	508 396 981	3 316 109 093
Other sexual offences	1 416	707 976	286 337	1 002 203 679	405 335 767	1 407 539 446
<b>GBV total</b>		<b>2 470 460</b>	<b>758 601</b>	<b>6 048 827 687</b>	<b>1 610 574 410</b>	<b>7 659 402 097</b>
Intimate partner violence (IPV)						
Crime category	2019 unit cost (EUR)	No of incidents women	No of incidents men	Cost women (EUR)	Cost men (EUR)	Total cost (EUR)
Homicide	321 944	68	12	21 891 441	3 863 195	25 754 636
Violence with injury	2 604	411 896	94 491	1 072 443 026	246 023 787	1 318 466 813
Violence without injury	847	558 214	103 041	472 710 187	87 257 809	559 967 996
Rape	7 457	159 531	4 091	1 189 642 672	30 507 100	1 220 149 772
Other sexual offences	1 416	75 675	28 634	107 124 766	40 534 001	147 658 767
<b>IPV total</b>		<b>1 205 384</b>	<b>230 269</b>	<b>2 863 812 091</b>	<b>408 185 893</b>	<b>3 271 997 984</b>

NB: Lost economic output is not broken down by sex nor adjusted for the wage gap. It also does not take into account unpaid care work.

Source: This table presents calculations by EIGE using data from the CSEW published by the ONS and homicide data published by the ONS (England and Wales homicide data, Tables 11a and 11b), the Scottish government (Scotland homicide data, Table 8) and the Police Service of Northern Ireland (Northern Ireland homicide data, 'Domestic abuse annual trends', Table 3.9). The unit costs used in the calculations were taken from Heeks et al. (2018).

### 2.2.2. Health services

Victims of gender-based and intimate partner violence make use of health services to treat the physical and mental harms caused. As described in the previous section, unit costs for each type

of crime category from Heeks et al. (2018) were adjusted to 2019 prices. The adjusted unit costs were then multiplied by the incidence of each category of crime for men and women to obtain the costs of gender-based and intimate partner violence by gender (Table 2).

**Table 2. Health service costs of gender-based and intimate partner violence, United Kingdom, 2019**

Gender-based violence (GBV)						
Crime category	2019 unit cost (EUR)	No of incidents women	No of incidents men	Cost women (EUR)	Cost men (EUR)	Total cost (EUR)
Homicide	1 110	98	47	137 489	65 939	203 428
Violence with injury	920	588 423	193 277	684 221 791	224 743 654	908 965 446
Violence without injury	270	797 449	210 764	272 136 075	71 924 960	344 061 035
Rape	1 110	376 514	68 176	528 230 584	95 647 568	623 878 151
Other sexual offences	390	707 976	286 337	348 981 638	141 143 705	490 125 343
<b>GBV total</b>		<b>2 470 460</b>	<b>758 601</b>	<b>1 833 707 577</b>	<b>533 525 825</b>	<b>2 367 233 403</b>
Intimate partner violence (IPV)						
Crime category	2019 unit cost (EUR)	No of incidents women	No of incidents men	Cost women (EUR)	Cost men (EUR)	Total cost (EUR)
Homicide	1 110	68	12	95 401	16 835	112 236
Violence with injury	920	411 896	94 491	478 955 138	109 874 701	588 829 839
Violence without injury	270	558 214	103 041	190 495 150	35 163 595	225 658 745
Rape	1 110	159 531	4 091	223 814 130	5 739 471	229 553 601
Other sexual offences	390	75 675	28 634	37 302 374	14 114 518	51 416 892
<b>IPV total</b>		<b>1 205 384</b>	<b>230 269</b>	<b>930 662 192</b>	<b>164 909 121</b>	<b>1 095 571 313</b>

Source: See Table 1.

### 2.2.3. Criminal justice system

The criminal justice system (such as the police and prosecutors) is often involved in the investigation of cases of gender-based violence or intimate partner violence. As mentioned earlier, unit costs for calculating the criminal justice system costs of gender-based and intimate partner violence were based on 2018 Home Office estimates from Heeks et al. (2018), adjusted for inflation. However, the

2018 Home Office report calculations do not include police time spent on no-crime incidents. This may result in an underestimation of the costs of police time related to cases of domestic violence, as ‘domestic incidents’ are often initially recorded as no-crime incidents even if they cross the crime threshold (Walby, 2004, p. 101). Therefore, Table 3 includes the estimated proportion of no-crime costs for police time spent on assault-related domestic incidents.

**Table 3. Criminal justice system costs of gender-based and intimate partner violence, United Kingdom, 2019**

Gender-based violence (GBV)						
Crime category	2019 unit cost (EUR)	No of incidents women	No of incidents men	Cost women (EUR)	Cost men (EUR)	Total cost (EUR)
Homicide	1 027 527	98	47	100 694 095	48 292 066	148 986 161
Violence with injury	3 160	588 423	193 277	1 859 298 346	610 716 451	2 470 014 798
Violence without injury	2603	797 449	210 764	2 076 297 460	548 760 808	2 625 058 268
Rape	8 772	376 514	68 176	3 302 630 857	598 012 720	3 900 643 577
Other sexual offences	1 454	707 976	286 337	1 029 048 421	416 192 975	1 445 241 395
<b>GBV total</b>		<b>2 470 460</b>	<b>758 601</b>	<b>8 367 969 178</b>	<b>2 221 975 021</b>	<b>10 589 944 199</b>
Intimate partner violence (IPV)						
Crime category	2019 unit cost (EUR)	No of incidents women	No of incidents men	Cost women (EUR)	Cost men (EUR)	Total cost (EUR)
Homicide	1 154 705	68	12	69 869 372	12 329 889	82 199 261
Violence with injury	3 551	411 896	94 491	1 301 508 526	298 572 558	1 600 081 084
Violence without injury	2926	558 214	103 041	1 453 407 441	268 285 203	1 721 692 643
Rape	9 858	159 531	4 091	1 399 342 397	35 884 623	1 435 227 020
Other sexual offences	1 633	75 675	28 634	109 994 180	41 619 734	151 613 913
<b>IPV total</b>		<b>1 205 384</b>	<b>230 269</b>	<b>4 334 121 916</b>	<b>656 692 006</b>	<b>4 990 813 921</b>
No-crime costs						
	GBV cost women (EUR)	GBV cost men (EUR)	Total GBV cost (EUR)	IPV cost women (EUR)	IPV cost men (EUR)	Total IPV cost (EUR)
No-crime costs	505 254 865	177 521 980	682 776 844	334 424 098	88 897 545	423 321 643

Source: See Table 1.

### 2.2.4. Civil justice system

Victims of intimate partner violence may make use of the civil justice system to disentangle themselves from a violent partner, with financial support from the Legal Aid Agency (LAA). This may take the form of matrimonial proceedings (such as divorce and judicial separation) or proceedings related to children. To estimate the proportion of civil justice system costs attributable to intimate partner violence, data were obtained from legal aid statistics for England and Wales provided by the LAA, which have been published quarterly since 2015. The legal aid statistics provide detailed data on both the volume and the value of successful applications for legal aid for civil representation and legal help by type of proceedings. This study is primarily concerned with private and public family law proceedings, as they cover the issues surrounding intimate partner violence.

The methodology used to obtain the civil justice system costs of intimate partner violence-related proceedings was based on the previous EIGE report (EIGE, 2014), with costs divided by type of family law (public and private) and type of

legal assistance (legal help and civil representation). For public family proceedings and legal help, costs for 2019/2020 were taken from the legal aid statistics using direct statistics on the total expenditure in these subcategories. The percentages of proceedings attributable to intimate partner violence estimated by Walby (2004) were then applied to these costs: 29 % of divorces are estimated to be related to intimate partner violence, whereas the co-occurrence of child abuse and intimate partner violence in public family law proceedings is estimated to be 40 % (mostly concerning the Children Act 1989) (Table 4).

For private family civil representation, an updated estimate of the proportion of expenditure attributable to intimate partner violence was used. Since 2013, the Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act 2012 has established that legal aid for private family law cases is available only when there is evidence of child abuse or domestic violence. Therefore, a new estimate was calculated using detailed information available on the number of applications and successful applications made through the domestic violence and child abuse gateway.

**Table 4. Civil justice system (CJS) costs of intimate partner violence (IPV), United Kingdom, 2019/2020**

Type of proceedings	Total expenditure (EUR)	% expenditure attributable to IPV	Total CJS cost (EUR)	CJS cost women (EUR)	CJS cost men (EUR)
Private family civil representation	113 854 683	42	47 884 132	40 203 842	7 680 290
Family legal help	11 155 793	29	3 235 184	2 716 283	518 902
Public family proceedings	638 925 071	40	255 570 385	214 578 629	40 991 756
<b>Total</b>			<b>306 689 701</b>	<b>257 498 754</b>	<b>49 190 947</b>

*Source:* This table presents calculations by EIGE using data from the legal aid statistics published by the ONS through the LAA. The multipliers used in the estimation of the costs of intimate partner violence were taken from Walby (2004) (for legal help and public civil representation) and from own calculations using the legal aid statistics (for private civil representation).

## Self-funded legal costs

Not all proceedings are financed through legal aid, as eligibility for legal aid is restricted by, for example, income. There are no direct statistics available on the costs of proceedings that are not financed by legal aid. However, the number of these proceedings in 2019/2020 can be obtained using the total number of family proceedings from family court statistics administrative data <sup>(1)</sup>.

In 2019, ONS divorce statistics <sup>(12)</sup> reported a total of 108 421 divorces in England and Wales concerning both opposite-sex couples (107,599, of which 66 986 (62 %) were petitioned by women and 40 613 (38 %) were petitioned by men) and same-sex couples (822). Extrapolated to the United Kingdom, the total number of divorces in 2019 was estimated to be 121 840. The number of non-legally aided divorces was estimated by subtracting the number of legally aided divorces from the total, giving a total of around 109 380 non-legally aided divorces in 2019.

Costs for divorces are not readily available and this study therefore used the average unit costs for defended (GBP 2 402) and unde-

fended (GBP 1 507) divorces in 1996 provided in the study by EIGE (2014) (based on Walby, 2004). These estimates rely on the author's assumption that the costs of proceedings borne by private applicants are the same as those for legally aided proceedings. The reported costs were adjusted to 2019 prices (GBP 4 543 for defended divorces and GBP 2 850 for undefended divorces) and converted to euro (EUR 5 140.61 and EUR 3 225.19, respectively). These costs were then multiplied by the estimated number of non-legally aided divorces in the United Kingdom, following Walby's (2004) assumption that 95 % of proceedings are undefended and 5 % are defended. The total UK cost of non-legally aided divorces was calculated as EUR 431 064 773. The total cost was then multiplied by Walby's (2004) estimated percentage of divorces attributable to intimate partner violence (29 %), giving a total UK cost of intimate partner violence-related divorces of EUR 125 008 784 in 2019 (Table 5). Adding this to the cost of other related proceedings (EUR 79 777 475) resulted in a total of EUR 204 786 259. The proportions of this cost attributable to intimate partner violence against women and intimate partner violence against men were obtained by multiplying the values by the gendered distribution of costs derived from the incidence distribution (Table 5).

**Table 5. Self-funded legal costs of intimate partner violence (IPV), United Kingdom, 2019**

	Total cost (EUR)	Total cost of self-funded IPV-related civil proceedings (EUR)	Cost women (EUR)	Cost men (EUR)
Matrimonial proceedings (divorces)	542 500 572	125 008 784	105 007 379	20 001 405
Other related proceedings	195 593 213	79 777 475	66 981 709	12 795 766
<b>Total</b>		<b>204 786 259</b>	<b>171 989 088</b>	<b>32 797 171</b>

Source: This table presents calculations by EIGE using data from legal aid statistics, the ONS (2019 divorce data for England and Wales) and Walby (2004).

<sup>(1)</sup> Ministry of Justice (2020), 'Family Court Statistics Quarterly: January to March 2020' (<https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/family-court-statistics-quarterly>).

<sup>(12)</sup> ONS (2019), 'Divorces in England and Wales 2019' (<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/divorce/datasets/divorcesinenglandandwales>).

### 2.2.5. Social welfare

The UK government has a statutory duty to assist people who have been made homeless because of intimate partner violence. The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Governance (MHCLG) provides annual updates on local authority revenue expenditure and financing, which includes data on total expenditure on homelessness prevention and relief in England. An estimate of 12.5 % for the proportion of people who received statutory assistance for homelessness because of domestic violence in 2019/2020 was derived

from the MHCLG live tables on homelessness<sup>(13)</sup> and used to extract the total cost of intimate partner violence-related homelessness owed statutory assistance. Moreover, local authorities have a homelessness prevention duty to victims of domestic abuse, which includes sanctuary schemes. The MHCLG live tables on homelessness estimate that 6.1 % of people are owed a prevention duty because of domestic abuse. This percentage was used to calculate the proportion of the GBP 140 million expenditure on homelessness prevention that is attributable to intimate partner violence (Table 6).

**Table 6. Cost of housing aid for intimate partner violence (IPV), United Kingdom, 2019**

Housing aid	Total cost of IPV-related housing aid (EUR)	Cost women (EUR)	Cost men (EUR)
Homeless owed statutory assistance	112 584 168	94 526 563	18 057 762
Homelessness prevention	11 902 159	9 993 133	1 909 026
<b>Total</b>	<b>124 486 327</b>	<b>104 519 697</b>	<b>19 966 787</b>

Source: This table presents calculations by EIGE using data from the MHCLG published by the ONS ('Local authority revenue expenditure and financing England'; 'Live tables on homelessness').

### 2.2.6. Personal costs

Individuals who are victims of intimate partner violence may incur costs that are not covered by the government. These include the costs of non-legally aided civil legal services as well as moving expenses and the costs of setting up a new home (Table 7). An estimate of the average cost of setting up a new home was obtained from 2006, 2014 and 2018 reports of the costs

of divorce from Aviva, in which costs were estimated from ad hoc surveys of recent divorcees (see the note in Table 7). Because of the high variability of these data, the estimated average cost of setting up a new home was obtained by averaging across the three estimates after adjusting for inflation. This cost was then multiplied by the estimated number of people who divorced because of intimate partner violence in 2019.

<sup>(13)</sup> MHCLG (2021), 'Live tables on homelessness' (<https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/live-tables-on-homelessness>).

**Table 7. Intimate partner violence (IPV)-related personal costs (civil legal services and moving expenses), United Kingdom, 2019**

	Total IPV-related personal costs (EUR)	Cost women (EUR)	Cost men (EUR)
Civil legal services	204 786 259	171 989 088	32 797 171
Moving home	400 000 085	335 842 786	64 157 300
<b>Total</b>	<b>604 786 345</b>	<b>507 831 874</b>	<b>96 954 471</b>

Source: This table presents calculations by EIGE using 2006, 2014 and 2018 data from Aviva on the hidden costs of divorce. An estimate of the number of people who divorced in 2019 was obtained from ONS *divorce statistics for England and Wales*. The cost of divorces used in the estimation of civil legal services costs was estimated using values from Walby (2004) and estimates from *legal aid statistics*.

### Housing aid and child protection

The total cost of local authority expenditure on children's social care was obtained from 2019/2020 MHLCG statistics on local authority revenue expenditure and financing in England <sup>(14)</sup>. To calculate the total expenditure on children in need when 'abuse or neglect' was listed as the primary reason, additional information was obtained from Department for Education statistics <sup>(15)</sup>. Finally, to calculate the cost of child protection attributable to intimate partner violence, an estimate was needed of the pro-

portion of children referred to social workers because of domestic abuse perpetuated against themselves or one of their parents. The best estimate of the co-occurrence of child abuse and domestic violence is 40 % (Walby, 2004).

The total estimated cost of child welfare attributable to intimate partner violence was calculated by multiplying the total expenditure on children in need by the co-occurrence multiplier and the proportion of children referred because of abuse or neglect (which amounts to 56 %) (Table 8).

**Table 8. Social welfare costs (housing aid and child protection) attributable to intimate partner violence (IPV), United Kingdom, 2019**

	Total IPV-related social welfare costs(EUR)	Cost women (EUR)	Cost men (EUR)
Housing aid	124 486 327	104 519 697	19 966 787
Child protection	1 814 834 058	1 523 746 989	291 087 069
<b>Total</b>	<b>1 939 320 385</b>	<b>1 628 266 686</b>	<b>311 053 856</b>

Source: This table presents calculations by EIGE using data from the MHLCG published by the ONS ('Local authority revenue expenditure and financing England'; 'Live tables on homelessness') and data from the Department for Education ('Characteristics of children in need, 2019 to 2020').

<sup>(14)</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/local-authority-revenue-expenditure-and-financing-england-2019-to-2020-final-out-turn>

<sup>(15)</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/statistics-children-in-need>

### 2.2.7. Specialist services

There are a number of government-funded specialist services for the prevention and/or mitigation of gender-based and intimate partner violence. The estimated cost of refuge services was obtained from the Women's Aid Federation of England (2019), which reported an annual cost per refuge space in 2018 of GBP 31 059. According to Women's Aid data on domestic abuse victim services, there are currently 3 914 refuge spaces in England. Multiplying the adjusted cost per refuge space by the number of available spaces provides the total refuge space cost in the United Kingdom. This was used to calculate

the costs of refuge services attributable to intimate partner violence and gender-based violence against women and men (Table 9).

The total cost of specialist advice services was based on government specialised service costs and costs obtained from several organisations offering specialised support, including Victim Support, SafeLives (previously Co-ordinated Action Against Domestic Abuse) and Respect. All but one of the costs were based on 2011/2012 estimates reported in EIGE (2014), adjusted for inflation. SafeLives (2019) published an updated figure for 2018/2019 in its financial statement and this was included in the final cost estimation.

**Table 9. Costs of specialist services for gender-based violence (GBV) and intimate partner violence (IPV), United Kingdom, 2019**

	Total cost (EUR)	Cost of GBV women (EUR)	Cost of GBV men (EUR)	Cost of IPV women (EUR)	Cost of IPV men (EUR)
Refuge services	167 439 520	128 103 073	39 336 447	140 583 554	26 856 200
Specialist advice services	17 193 953	22 295 885	6 846 369	14 436 160	2 757 793
<b>Total</b>	<b>184 633 473</b>	<b>150 398 958</b>	<b>46 182 816</b>	<b>155 019 714</b>	<b>29 613 994</b>

Source: This table presents calculations by EIGE using data from EIGE (2014), SafeLives (2019) and the Women's Aid Federation of England (2019).

### 2.2.8. Physical and emotional impacts on victims

The physical and emotional impacts of gender-based and intimate partner violence result in a reduction in the quality of life of the victims.

As detailed in Section 2.1, the costs of the physical and emotional impacts of gender-based and intimate partner violence on victims were estimated by multiplying the 2018 Home Office report unit costs, adjusted to 2019 prices, by the incidence of crime for each crime category (Table 10).

**Table 10. Costs of the physical and emotional impacts of gender-based and intimate partner violence on victims, United Kingdom, 2019**

Gender-based violence (GBV)						
Crime category	2019 unit cost (EUR)	No of incidents women	No of incidents men	Cost women (EUR)	Cost men (EUR)	Total cost (EUR)
Homicide	2 325 993	98	47	257 938 353	123 705 128	381 643 481
Violence with injury	9 204	588 423	193 277	6 128 247 349	2 012 921 424	8 141 168 773
Violence without injury	3 139	797 449	210 764	2 832 231 001	748 552 365	3 580 783 366
Rape	27 243	376 514	68 176	11 606 796 339	2 101 661 418	13 708 457 758
Other sexual offences	4 133	707 976	286 337	3 310 851 440	1 339 055 658	4 649 907 098
<b>GBV total</b>		<b>2 470 460</b>	<b>758 601</b>	<b>24 136 064 483</b>	<b>6 325 895 993</b>	<b>30 461 960 476</b>
Intimate partner violence (IPV)						
Crime category	2019 unit cost (EUR)	No of incidents women	No of incidents men	Cost women (EUR)	Cost men (EUR)	Total cost (EUR)
Homicide	2 325 993	68	12	178 977 632	31 584 288	210 561 921
Violence with injury	9 204	411 896	94 491	4 289 772 103	984 095 150	5 273 867 253
Violence without injury	3 139	558 214	103 041	1 982 560 635	365 961 854	2 348 522 489
Rape	27 243	159 531	4 091	4 917 861 824	126 113 249	5 043 975 073
Other sexual offences	4 133	75 675	28 634	353 894 317	133 906 969	487 801 285
<b>IPV total</b>		<b>1 205 384</b>	<b>230 269</b>	<b>11 723 066 512</b>	<b>1 641 661 510</b>	<b>13 364 728 021</b>

Source: See Table 1.

## Summary

Table 11 summarises the estimated costs of gender-based and intimate partner violence against women and men in the United Kingdom in 2019. The figures show that the most significant

costs are associated with the physical and emotional impacts (55.6 %), followed by the criminal justice system (20.6 %) and lost economic output (14.0 %). The smallest costs are associated with the civil justice system and specialised services, which account for less than 1 % of the total cost.

**Table 11. Costs of gender-based and intimate partner violence, United Kingdom, 2019**

Gender-based violence (GBV)					
Sector	GBV cost women (EUR)	% of cost	GBV cost men (EUR)	Total cost (EUR)	% of cost
Lost economic output	6 048 827 687	13.93	1 610 574 410	7 659 402 097	13.97
Health services	1 833 707 577	4.22	533 525 825	2 367 233 403	4.32
Criminal justice system	8 873 224 043	20.43	2 399 497 000	11 272 721 043	20.57
Civil justice system	257 498 754	0.59	49 190 947	306 689 701	0.56
Social welfare	1 628 266 686	3.75	311 053 856	1 939 320 385	3.54
Personal costs	507 831 874	1.17	96 954 471	604 786 345	1.10
Specialist services	150 398 958	0.35	46 182 816	196 581 774	0.36
Physical/emotional impacts	24 136 064 483	55.57	6 325 895 993	30 461 960 476	55.58
<b>Total</b>	<b>43 435 820 062</b>		<b>11 372 875 318</b>	<b>54 808 695 224</b>	
Intimate partner violence (IPV)					
Sector	IPV cost women (EUR)	% of cost	IPV cost men (EUR)	Total cost (EUR)	% of cost
Lost economic output	2 863 812 091	12.60	408 185 893	3 271 997 984	12.50
Health services	930 662 192	4.09	164 909 121	1 095 571 313	4.18
Criminal justice system	4 668 546 014	20.53	745 589 551	5 414 135 565	20.68
Civil justice system	257 498 754	1.13	49 190 947	306 689 701	1.17
Social welfare	1 628 266 686	7.16	311 053 856	1 939 320 385	7.41
Personal costs	507 831 874	2.23	96 954 471	604 786 345	2.31
Specialist services	155 019 714	0.68	29 613 994	184 633 708	0.71
Physical/emotional impacts	11 723 066 512	51.56	1 641 661 510	13 364 728 021	51.05
<b>Total</b>	<b>22 734 703 835</b>		<b>3 447 159 342</b>	<b>26 181 863 020</b>	

## 2.3. Extrapolation to EU Member States

As shown in Table 11, in 2019, the estimated cost of gender-based violence against women in the United Kingdom was EUR 43 435 820 062. Extrapolating this cost by the population size of each EU Member State gives an estimated cost of gender-based violence against women in the EU-27 of EUR 290 309 795 927 (Table 12).

Similarly, in 2019, the estimated cost of intimate partner violence against women in the United Kingdom was EUR 22 734 703 835. Extrapolating this cost by the population size of each EU Member State gives an estimated cost of intimate partner violence against women in the EU-27 of EUR 151 950 791 341. Detailed information on the population multipliers used to extrapolate UK costs to EU Member States is provided in Table 13.

**Table 12. Extrapolated costs of gender-based violence (GBV) and intimate partner violence (IPV) against women and men (in euro, non-purchasing power parity) in EU Member States, 2019**

Member State	Cost of GBV women	Total cost of GBV	Cost of IPV women	Total cost of IPV
Belgium	7 449 156 395	9 399 581 772	3 898 956 304	4 490 137 220
Bulgaria	4 551 900 728	5 743 732 692	2 382 506 300	2 743 754 836
Czechia	6 925 223 185	8 738 466 232	3 624 724 890	4 174 325 351
Denmark	3 775 508 155	4 764 055 922	1 976 135 356	2 275 767 724
Germany	53 984 730 101	68 119 644 447	28 256 099 430	32 540 442 582
Estonia	861 487 932	1 087 052 793	450 910 630	519 280 147
Ireland	3 189 069 893	4 024 069 526	1 669 188 228	1 922 279 607
Greece	6 973 862 574	8 799 840 956	3 650 183 189	4 203 643 775
Spain	30 521 663 893	38 513 203 426	15 975 316 874	18 397 581 122
France	43 683 460 939	55 121 176 337	22 864 321 326	26 331 133 819
Croatia	2 650 651 966	3 344 676 710	1 387 375 381	1 597 736 766
Italy	38 896 862 916	49 081 295 155	20 358 972 324	23 445 910 204
Cyprus	569 569 012	718 700 242	298 117 608	343 319 818
Latvia	1 248 493 578	1 575 388 790	653 472 910	752 556 019
Lithuania	1 816 968 189	2 292 708 082	951 017 699	1 095 216 164
Luxembourg	399 195 568	503 717 627	208 942 596	240 623 607
Hungary	6 354 909 616	8 018 826 485	3 326 217 574	3 830 556 735
Malta	320 945 579	404 979 310	167 985 839	193 456 764
Netherlands	11 238 036 009	14 180 510 225	5 882 090 403	6 773 964 875
Austria	5 760 577 102	7 268 878 871	3 015 138 523	3 472 310 190
Poland	24 692 501 084	31 157 780 935	12 924 279 968	14 883 929 441
Portugal	6 682 554 255	8 432 258 882	3 497 709 762	4 028 051 500
Romania	12 624 599 021	15 930 119 406	6 607 830 113	7 609 745 178
Slovenia	1 353 147 695	1 707 444 674	708 249 828	815 638 511
Slovakia	3 544 233 871	4 472 226 695	1 855 084 289	2 136 362 237
Finland	3 588 125 654	4 527 610 740	1 878 057 648	2 162 818 942
Sweden	6 652 361 016	8 394 160 094	3 481 906 346	4 009 851 883
<b>EU-27</b>	<b>290 309 795 927</b>	<b>366 322 107 026</b>	<b>151 950 791 341</b>	<b>174 990 395 017</b>

**Table 13. Population of EU Member States in 2019 and multipliers used to extrapolate UK costs to EU Member States**

Member State	Population	Multiplier used to extrapolate UK costs to Member States
Belgium	11 455 519	0.171498
Bulgaria	7 000 039	0.104796
Czechia	10 649 800	0.159436
Denmark	5 806 081	0.086922
Germany	83 019 213	1.242862
Estonia	1 324 820	0.019834
Ireland	4 904 240	0.073420
Greece	10 724 599	0.160556
Spain	46 937 060	0.702684
France	67 177 636	1.005701
Croatia	4 076 246	0.061025
Italy	59 816 673	0.895502
Cyprus	875 899	0.013113
Latvia	1 919 968	0.028743
Lithuania	2 794 184	0.041831
Luxembourg	613 894	0.009190
Hungary	9 772 756	0.146306
Malta	493 559	0.007389
Netherlands	17 282 163	0.258727
Austria	8 858 775	0.132623
Poland	37 972 812	0.568482
Portugal	10 276 617	0.153849
Romania	19 414 458	0.290649
Slovenia	2 080 908	0.031153
Slovakia	5 450 421	0.081597
Finland	5 517 919	0.082608
Sweden	10 230 185	0.153154

NB: Eurostat population estimates are from 1 January 2019 [tps00001]. Data for France are provisional. The total mid-2019 population estimate for the United Kingdom was 66 796 807.

## 2.4. Conclusions

This section has presented updated cost estimates for gender-based violence and intimate partner violence in the EU-27. It provides an estimated cost of EUR 366 billion for gender-based violence (of which 79 % is carried out against women) and EUR 175 billion for intimate partner violence (of which 87 % is carried out against women). These results are around one third higher than the previous estimates. One important reason for this increase is the changes in the offences included in this study (because of changes to the structure of the CSEW and the Home Office methodology) and the higher incidence of offences. The increase in incidence may partly result from the methodological changes described in Section 2 and further elaborated in the accompanying technical report, in order to match the available unit costs to incidence, but the following additional considerations should also be taken into account.

- Improvements in survey techniques and data availability may have skewed some of the results. For example, data obtained from the legal aid statistics allowed for greater precision in the results, which consequently differ greatly from the previous estimates. Moreover, the previous study based its estimates on microdata from the face-to-face CSEW, which were scaled up by a ratio of 3.8 to take into account the bias in the disclosure rate compared with self-completion modules. In contrast, this study relied only on the published self-completion modules on domestic

abuse, removing the need for the disclosure multiplier to account for under-reporting in the face-to-face mode of interviewing.

- Public debate (#MeToo) may have reduced the barriers that prevent victims coming forward, which may have contributed towards the higher level of reporting of these incidences of crime.
- The estimated unit costs from the 2018 Home Office report are higher than those used previously, even when adjusting the older unit costs for inflation. This increase in costs may be related to changes in the methodology used in the 2018 report compared with the report by Dubourg et al. (2005) (e.g. in the calculation of health costs in the 2018 report, the proportion of people who seek medical assistance is based on real data rather than assumptions) or other market changes.
- Changes in public funding (because of austerity, or decentralisation to smaller geographical areas or the community) may have been difficult to capture.
- The 2014 methodology excluded incidents of exposure, whereas the current study included 'indecent exposure' in the category of other sexual assaults.

These considerations are discussed further in Section 3 and in the accompanying technical report.

## 3. Methodologies for estimating the costs of gender-based violence and violence against women and men – critical review

The main objective of this review was to critically assess studies carried out in the EU to estimate the costs of gender-based and intimate partner violence that have been published since EIGE's 2014 study. Based on an in-depth assessment of the costing methodologies applied in the literature, this review aimed to provide a set of lessons learned for future costing studies at European level. This review accompanies the updated study on the costs of gender-based and intimate partner violence in the EU based on EIGE's 2014 methodology, which used the United Kingdom as a case study, with costs extrapolated to the EU-27. Considering the limitations of this methodology based on extrapolation, discussed in detail in Section 2, a key consideration in this review was to assess whether recent literature can provide recommendations for estimating the costs of gender-based violence at Member State and European levels.

### 3.1. Methodology of the literature search

The literature review mainly identified studies and reports that calculated the economic costs of gender-based violence, including intimate partner violence and domestic violence. A study calculating the costs of interpersonal violence against women and men was also included as it followed an econometric approach to estimate costs of violence that could also be applied to estimate the costs of gender-based violence. In addition, a study calculating the costs of trafficking in the EU was included to provide insights into methodologies for estimating costs at EU level.

In addition to studies carried out in the Member States and/or at EU level, a few studies were identified that were carried out outside the EU. The literature research was carried out mainly in English as this is the language in which most of the literature is written. For some sites and documents, French, German and Spanish were also used. The literature searches were focused on costs, costs of violence against women, costs of intimate violence and costs of domestic violence.

To identify relevant literature the following steps were followed.

1. Electronic searches were carried out in English using general search engines (Google, Google Scholar, ResearchGate) and keywords or expressions. Many of the reports and publications identified were published works by UN agencies or other development agencies (UK Aid, Australian Aid, the Commonwealth).
2. A search of the website of the Council of Europe Group of Experts on Action against Violence against Women and Domestic Violence (GREVIO) was carried out. For transparency, GREVIO publishes reports by governments and by non-governmental organisations (NGOs) from states that have signed and ratified the Istanbul Convention<sup>(16)</sup>. Between 2016 and spring 2021, the governments of 15 EU Member States<sup>(17)</sup> submitted reports on how the Istanbul Convention has been implemented in their country. All these reports were reviewed, including any extended annexes, particularly information provided under Article 11 on data collection and research.

<sup>(16)</sup> <https://www.coe.int/en/web/istanbul-convention/country-monitoring-work>

<sup>(17)</sup> Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Spain, France, Italy, Malta, Netherlands, Austria, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Finland and Sweden.

3. Searches were carried out in academic journals such as the *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *Violence Against Women* and *Feminist Economics*.
4. The publications sections of academic websites that present the work of the following authors in this field were searched: Sylvia Walby<sup>(18)</sup>, Nata Duvvury<sup>(19)</sup>, Philippa Olive<sup>(20)</sup> and Caroline Forde<sup>(21)</sup>.
5. The publications sections of the websites of several international organisations working in the area of violence against women were searched:
- UN Women, United Nations Development Programme, United Nations Population Fund, UN Children's Fund Office of Research – Innocenti, CARE, Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe<sup>(22)</sup> and Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)<sup>(23)</sup>.
6. Finally, a snowballing approach was used to identify additional studies cited in the bibliographies and references of the identified literature.
- A full list of the studies identified is provided in Table 14.

**Table 14. Cost studies published after 2014 considered for review**

Location	Author and year of publication	Title and language	Scope of study	Observations
Ireland	Ford and Duvvury (forthcoming) <sup>(a)</sup>	'The social and economic cost of domestic abuse for women in Ireland' (English)	The costs of domestic abuse against women and children (girls and boys).	<b>Not used in the analysis.</b> This publication was not selected for in-depth analysis because of a lack of online access to the entire study. The organisation Safe Ireland cites this research in its 2019 and 2020 publications <sup>(b)</sup> .
Finland	Hietamäki et al. (2020)	'Arvio turvakotien perhepaikkojen riittävästä määrästä ja kustannuksista' ['Estimate of needed places for families in shelters and their costs'] (Finnish)	The impact of domestic and intimate partner violence – women and children who look for refuge in shelters.	<b>Not used in the analysis.</b> This publication is available only in Finnish.

<sup>(18)</sup> <https://www.city.ac.uk/about/people/academics/sylvia-walby>

<sup>(19)</sup> <https://www.nuigalway.ie/our-research/people/political-science-and-sociology/nataduvvury/>

<sup>(20)</sup> <https://www.uclan.ac.uk/academics/dr-philippa-olive>

<sup>(21)</sup> <https://www.nuigalway.ie/our-research/people/political-science-and-sociology/carolineforde/>

<sup>(22)</sup> Based on the results of a survey on violence against women (<https://www.osce.org/VAWsurvey/publications>), carried out in 2018 in eight European countries (not EU Member States: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo<sup>(\*)</sup>, Moldova, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Ukraine), the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) plans to carry out a comparative study (meta-study) on the costs of violence against women and the budgets allocated for prevention and response (OSCE, 2019).  
<sup>(\*)</sup> This designation is without prejudice to positions on status, and is in line with UN SCR 1244/1999 and the ICJ Opinion on the Kosovo declaration of independence.

<sup>(23)</sup> The topic of violence against women (<https://www.oecd.org/gender/vaw.htm>) has only recently been considered by the OECD (since 2019: identified in the OECD's Public Governance Committee's strategy for gender mainstreaming and its action plan). The main event carried out by the OECD has been the High-Level Conference on Ending Violence Against Women in February 2020 (<https://www.oecd.org/social/ending-violence-against-women-2020.htm>), which had a particular focus on sexual harassment at work (OECD, 2017). No studies or research have yet been carried out on costs.

Location	Author and year of publication	Title and language	Scope of study	Observations
Italy	Ciaschini and Chelli (2020)	'Evaluating the impact of violence against women in the macroeconomic input-output framework' (English)	Violence against women and girls – women aged from 16 to 70; intimate partner violence against women: physical or psychological abuse during their lifetime and physical and/or sexual assault.	<b>Not used in the analysis.</b> The methodology proposed by Badalassi et al. (2013) to calculate the costs of violence against women was reviewed in the 2014 EIGE report (see Italy; INTERVITA (2013)). This study uses the costs from 2013 to develop an input-output approach to develop a stimulation tool for determining total output gains and losses to the economy.
United Kingdom	Oliver et al. (2019)	The Economic and Social Costs of Domestic Abuse (English)	The costs of domestic abuse; data are not disaggregated by sex.	Used in the analysis.
Spain	Alcon et al. (2019)	El Impacto de la Violencia de Genero en Espana: Una valoración de sus costes en 2016 [The Impact of Gender-based Violence in Spain: Estimates of its costs for 2016] (Spanish)	The costs of intimate partner violence against women; an analysis of perpetrators, employers and friends and family members is also included.	Used in the analysis.
France	Néréa et al. (2018)	Où est l'argent contre les violences faites aux femmes? [Where is the money for combating violence against women?] (French)	The costs of intimate partner violence against women after women leave a violent relationship.	Used in the analysis.
France	Cavalin et al. (2015)	Étude relative à l'actualisation du chiffrage des répercussions économiques des violences au sein du couple et leur incidence sur les enfants en France en 2012: Rapport final de l'étude [Study updating the economic quantification of intimate partner violence and its consequences on children in France in 2012: Final report] (French)	Costs of intimate partner violence against women and men; an analysis of perpetrators (both women and men) and the impact of intimate partner violence on children is included.	Used in the analysis.
Sweden	Ornstein, P. (2017)	'The price of violence: consequences of violent crime in Sweden' (English)	The cost of non-lethal interpersonal violence against women and men.	Used in the analysis.
Germany	Sacco, S. (2017)	Häusliche Gewalt Kostenstudie für Deutschland – Gewalt gegen Frauen in (ehemaligen) Partnerschaften [Cost of domestic violence against women in (ex)partnerships in Germany] (German)	Domestic violence against women	<b>Not used in the analysis.</b> This publication is available only in paper (hard copy) format.

Location	Author and year of publication	Title and language	Scope of study	Observations
EU-27/EU-28	Walby et al. (2020)	Study on the economic, social and human costs of trafficking in human beings within the EU (English)	The costs of trafficking in human beings – trafficked victims suffer harms of physical violence and sexual violence and threats. The study includes women, men and children and several forms of exploitation (sexual, labour, other)	Used in the analysis.
EU-27	EPRS (2021)	Combating Gender-based violence: Cyber violence (English)	The costs of gender-based cyberviolence against women.	Used in the analysis.

<sup>(a)</sup> The study is cited under this title in Safe Ireland (2021), p. 3, footnote 12.

<sup>(b)</sup> 'A new study conducted by NUI Galway and Safe Ireland is giving a clearer indication of **the combined costs of domestic violence on an individual basis**. It is showing that the total average cost of domestic violence to a survivor is €115 790 delineated across three distinct phases of a woman's journey from abuse to recovery' (bold added for emphasis). See Safe Ireland (2019).

Of the 11 studies identified, two were not selected for in-depth analysis because of a lack of online access to the entire study (Ford and Duvvury, forthcoming; Sacco, 2017). Moreover, the study by Hietamäki et al. (2020) was not selected as it was accessible only in Finnish. In addition, the study by Ciaschini and Chelli (2020) was not included because it follows up on costs estimated in a previous study carried out in 2013 to develop an input-output model determining total output gains and losses to the economy. As the purpose of the literature review was to assess the methodologies used for estimating costs, this study was outside the scope of this review.

### 3.2. Overview of the selected studies

The following sections outline the methodologies identified for estimating the costs of gender-based violence or violence against women. First, this section provides an overview of the studies selected for in-depth assessment. Section 3.3 then provides a comparison of the methodological approaches followed.

As shown in Table 15, four of the seven studies selected estimated the costs of gender-based violence against women, focusing on domestic abuse, intimate partner violence or gender-based cyberviolence. One Member State study (Ornstein, 2017) estimated the costs of interpersonal violence against women and men and one EU-level study (Walby et al., 2020) estimated the costs of trafficking of women and men. Similar to the present study, some of the selected studies (Cavalin et al., 2015; Ornstein, 2017; Walby et al., 2020) calculated separate costs for women and men. Other studies (Alcon et al., 2019; Cavalin et al., 2015; EPRS, 2021) considered costs for other agents such as family and friends of victims, the perpetrator, and employers. Moreover, one study (Cavalin et al., 2015) calculated the cost of the impact of intimate partner violence on children. The study by Oliver et al. (2019) for the United Kingdom presents a methodology for calculating the impacts on children from witnessing domestic abuse but does not include them in the final calculations.

**Table 15. The scope of EIGE’s 2021 study and the seven studies selected for in-depth analysis**

Location	Author and year of publication	Title and language	Scope of costing study
EU-27/UK	EIGE (2021)	Present study	Costs of gender-based and intimate partner violence against women and men in the EU-27 and the United Kingdom
EU-27	EPRS (2021)	Combating Gender-based Violence: Cyber violence (English)	Costs of gender-based cyberviolence against women in the EU-27
EU-27/EU-28	Walby et al. (2020)	Study on the economic, social and human costs of trafficking in human beings within the EU (English)	Costs of trafficking in human beings in the EU-27 and EU-28.
United Kingdom	Oliver et al. (2019)	The Economic and Social Costs of Domestic Abuse (English)	Costs of domestic abuse in the United Kingdom; data were not calculated separately for women.
Spain	Alcon et al. (2019)	El Impacto de la Violencia de Genero en España: Una valoración de sus costes en 2016 [The Impact of Gender-based Violence in Spain: Estimates of its costs for 2016] (Spanish)	Costs of intimate partner violence against women in Spain.
France	Cavalin et al. (2015)	Étude relative à l'actualisation du chiffrage des répercussions économiques des violences au sein du couple et leur incidence sur les enfants en France en 2012: Rapport final de l'étude [Study updating the economic quantification of intimate partner violence and its consequences on children in France in 2012: Final report] (France)	Costs of intimate partner violence against women and men in France.
France	Néréa et al. (2018)	Où est l'argent contre les violences faites aux femmes? [Where is the money for combating violence against women?] (France)	Costs of intimate partner violence against women in France.
Sweden	Ornstein (2017)	'The price of violence: consequences of violent crime in Sweden' (English)	Costs of non-lethal interpersonal violence against women and men in Sweden.

### 3.3. Comparison of methodologies for estimating the costs of gender-based violence or violence against women and men

The majority of studies reviewed followed an accounting approach to estimate the costs of gender-based violence or violence against women and men. In the accounting approach, the costs can be calculated using a **bottom-up methodology** or a **top-down methodology**. In the bottom-up approach, a unit cost is established that is then multiplied by the number of victims and/or incidents of a crime (EIGE, 2014). In the top-down approach, a total service or overall budget cost is established and

the proportion of service use attributable to gender-based violence is identified (Chan and Cho, 2010). To provide a detailed assessment of the methodologies used in this study and the selected literature, the following sections compare the approaches used to estimate the costs of gender-based violence or violence against women and men by type of cost calculated.

#### 3.3.1. Lost economic output

Lost economic output relates to a variety of costs associated with the work status and productivity of the victims. In general, the lost economic output associated with gender-based violence not only impacts on the victims and their acquaintances, but also often results in costs to employers and the general society. Given the limited availability of data, it is often difficult to

isolate the costs borne by other actors (employers and society) from those borne by the victims. **Table 16 shows that the majority of the studies reviewed focused on victim costs, with**

only a few (Alcon et al., 2019; Cavalin et al., 2015; EPRS, 2021) separately considering the economic impact of gender-based violence on employers or the state in terms of lost tax revenue.

**Table 16. Comparison of methodologies used to estimate lost economic output**

Author and year	Types of costs and actors bearing the costs	Methodology used	Elements needed to estimate costs	Types of data source used
EIGE (2021)	Victim losses: loss of earnings from time taken off work and loss of productivity	Bottom-up: unit cost multiplied by number of incidents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit cost: average cost of lost productivity for crime victims</li> <li>Incidence data: number of incidents of gender-based and intimate partner violence in the United Kingdom</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit cost: existing 2018 Home Office research on the economic and social costs of crime</li> <li>Incidence: estimated from 2019/2020 CSEW data and 2019 ONS data</li> </ul>
Oliver et al. (2019)	Victim losses: loss of earnings and productivity	Bottom-up: unit cost of time taken off work and reduced productivity following victimisation multiplied by average time taken off work multiplied by incidence of domestic abuse	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit cost: average hourly earnings by employment status multiplied by average time taken off work</li> <li>Incidence: number of repeated incidents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit cost: labour market data (employment rate and wages) from the ONS and Eurostat, average time taken off work from the CSEW</li> <li>Incidence: CSEW survey data (prevalence of domestic abuse by employment status, number of repeated incidents)</li> </ul>
Walby et al. (2020)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Victim losses: lost wages from unrewarded employment and increase in likelihood of unemployment post trafficking</li> <li>Employer losses: loss of profits</li> <li>State losses: loss of tax revenues</li> </ul>	Bottom-up: unit cost (GDP per capita) multiplied by the number of victims of trafficking, average duration of human trafficking and time spent in specialised services and helping law enforcement or by the increased likelihood of unemployment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit cost: GDP per capita</li> <li>Multipliers: duration of trafficking (in months and years) and time spent in specialised services and helping law enforcement per year, likelihood of being unemployed or unable to work</li> <li>Prevalence: number of human trafficking victims</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit cost: Eurostat</li> <li>Multipliers: duration of trafficking from a review of existing literature; time spent in specialised services or helping law enforcement from national rapporteurs and equivalent mechanisms; likelihood of being unemployed or unable to work from the Adult Psychiatric Morbidity Survey</li> </ul>
Cavalin et al. (2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Employer losses: sick pay, absenteeism and incapacity to work</li> <li>Other – cost to society: perpetrator losses: productivity loss because of imprisonment</li> </ul>	Bottom-up: average expenditure per beneficiary on sick pay and hourly salary multiplied by the number of beneficiaries as a result of intimate partner violence / difference in absence days	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit costs: average expenditure per beneficiary on sick pay, absenteeism costs, average salary</li> <li>Prevalence: number of beneficiaries as a result of intimate partner violence</li> <li>Multiplier: number of lost hours</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit costs: National Assembly report on sick pay, Insee and existing literature</li> <li>Prevalence: Insee, existing literature (Reed et al., 2018) and National Observatory of Crime and Criminal Justice data</li> </ul>
Ornstein (2017)	Victim losses: loss of productivity measured as reduced earnings	Econometric approach: propensity score matching used to estimate reductions in earnings	Effects of assault on income: estimated decrease in income of a victim in the period following the assault	Effects of assault on income: based on a regression model

Author and year	Types of costs and actors bearing the costs	Methodology used	Elements needed to estimate costs	Types of data source used
EPRS (2021)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Victim losses: loss of income from reduced productivity, increased absences and lower employment rate</li> <li>Cost to society / overall economy: loss of tax revenue</li> </ul>	Bottom-up: unit costs of loss of income and loss of tax revenue multiplied by prevalence data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit cost for the victim: average salary multiplied by reduction in average hours worked, including loss of working hours as a result of chronic depression</li> <li>Unit cost for the state: average income tax rates multiplied by loss of labour market income</li> <li>Prevalence: rates of gender-based cyberviolence and regression-based estimate of prevalence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit costs: loss of labour market income from Eurostat, the OECD and the EU-Compass for Action on Mental Health and Well-being; loss of tax revenue from the OECD</li> <li>Prevalence data: European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights 2012 and 2019 surveys, social media use from Eurostat [isco_ci_ac_i] and regression-based predictions</li> </ul>
Alcon et al. (2019)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Victim losses: inactivity, loss of job, unemployment, loss of productivity because of impact on mental health</li> <li>Employer losses: loss of productivity</li> <li>Cost to society / overall economy: imprisonment of offenders, unemployment benefits</li> </ul>	Bottom-up: unit costs multiplied by prevalence data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit costs: average salary, average sick pay, average profits (for employers), unemployment benefits</li> <li>Days lost: number of estimated days of work lost because of violence (for the victim, family members, friends and employers)</li> <li>Multipliers: discount rate for productivity loss (for employers' losses)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit costs: labour force surveys (Encuesta de Población Activa; Encuesta de Estructura Salarial; Encuesta de Empleo del Tiempo 2009–2010)</li> <li>Days lost: Macroencuesta de la Violencia contra la Mujer (2015) de la Delegación del Gobierno para la Violencia de Género (2015 Survey on Violence against Women)</li> </ul>

NB: GDP, gross domestic product; Insee, National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies

**The methodology was similar across the studies, with the majority using a bottom-up approach to quantify the costs of lost economic output.** This bottom-up methodology consisted of measuring the total amount of time (in hours) lost at work as a consequence of gender-based violence and multiplying this by the average national wage. The methodology used to estimate the proportion of lost hours at work that are attributable to gender-based violence varied, with most studies relying on representative survey data on the prevalence of gender-based violence. As discussed in Walby et al. (2020), depending on the type of unit cost used (gross domestic product or net wages), the approach may also incorporate the output lost in taxed income from the overall economy. This is because gross estimates of earnings include the portion of the taxed

income that benefits society as a whole. One study (Ornstein, 2017) applied a regression analysis using panel data on hospitalisations because of assault to estimate the impact of interpersonal violence on victims' earnings. Compared with the reliance of other studies on survey data, this methodology takes advantage of the larger-scale administrative data available to apply propensity score matching, that is, to compare the outcomes of individuals who visited a hospital after an assault with the outcomes of individuals who did not experience an assault but who were statistically indistinguishable from the victims of assault. In doing so, it addresses some of the existing limitations in the literature in terms of causal inference, thus providing a robust estimate of the effect of interpersonal violence on lost economic output.

### 3.3.2. Healthcare costs

Healthcare costs refer to the public expenditure on health services attributable to gender-based violence. Victims may require healthcare services for both physical and emotional harms as a consequence of the violence incurred. Therefore, healthcare costs are an important component of the costs of gender-based violence.

**Table 17 shows that the approach used for the estimation of healthcare costs was similar across studies, with all using a bottom-up methodology.** This consisted of multiplying the unit cost of each injury by the number of victims making use of the health service. In the case of health services, two factors need to be considered to estimate the prevalence of costs: first, the likelihood of any act of violence resulting in physical or emotional injuries and, second, the extent to which victims use healthcare services as required. In the case of gender-based

violence (and especially intimate partner violence), not all victims seek medical assistance for fear of repercussions or out of shame. **Only one study (Alcon et al., 2019) integrated the lower likelihood of seeking medical assistance into the analysis.** Most of the healthcare costs calculated in the studies reviewed related to service sector costs. In the majority of the countries in which the studies were based, healthcare services are provided by national health service authorities and thus the costs of medical procedures fall on the service sector. In some cases, victims may seek private health services offered by private specialised associations or private health professionals, in which case victims bear the costs. These types of costs are harder to isolate and are thus not included in the studies reviewed, except for the study by Alcon et al. (2019), which theoretically distinguishes between public and private sector and private costs, as well as including the costs of pharmaceuticals (not covered by the Spanish healthcare system).

**Table 17. Comparison of methodologies used to estimate healthcare costs**

Author and year	Types of costs and actors bearing the costs	Methodology used	Elements needed to estimate costs	Types of data source used
EIGE (2021)	Service sector costs: health service costs (ambulance, medical procedure and counselling costs) associated with physical and emotional harms of violence	Bottom-up: unit cost of health services multiplied by number of incidents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit cost: average health cost of all injuries suffered as a result of the crime (by category)</li> <li>Incidence data: number of incidents of gender-based and intimate partner violence in the United Kingdom</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit cost: existing 2018 Home Office research on the economic and social costs of crime</li> <li>Incidence: estimated from 2019/2020 CSEW data and 2019 ONS data</li> </ul>
Oliver et al. (2019)	Service sector costs: health service costs (ambulance, medical procedure and counselling costs) associated with physical and emotional harms of violence	Bottom-up: unit costs (average costs of healthcare services multiplied by likelihood of victims suffering the respective injury) multiplied by number of incidents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit costs: average costs of medical procedures (or hourly rate for counselling)</li> <li>Multiplier: likelihood of suffering injuries or needing counselling</li> <li>Incidence data: prevalence data combined with co-occurrence of different types of abuse</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit costs: costs of healthcare activities obtained from Curtis and Burns (2016) and NHS reference costs (Department of Health, 2017)</li> <li>Multiplier: likelihood of requiring health services (CSEW)</li> <li>Incidence: CSEW domestic abuse module</li> </ul>

Author and year	Types of costs and actors bearing the costs	Methodology used	Elements needed to estimate costs	Types of data source used
Walby et al. (2020)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Victim losses: higher likelihood of suffering injuries</li> <li>Service sector costs: health services costs</li> </ul>	Bottom-up: unit costs of health services multiplied by the likelihood of victims of trafficking using these services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit costs: costs of health services and social protection in the EU-28/EU-27</li> <li>Frequency data: extent to which trafficking victims are more likely to use services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit costs: Eurostat</li> <li>Frequency data: systematic review of the literature and analysis of data sets on trafficking (PROTECT; Oram et al., 2015), health (Adult Psychiatric Morbidity Survey, Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children) and crime (CSEW)</li> </ul>
Cavalin et al. (2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Service sector costs: healthcare costs (including costs of emergency services and hospitalisations and medical devices) attributable to intimate partner violence</li> <li>Victim costs: additional consultations (with general practitioners or for psychological support)</li> </ul>	Bottom-up: unit costs of healthcare services multiplied by the number of victims in need of support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Service sector costs – unit costs: healthcare services; prevalence: number of victims in need of support</li> <li>Victim costs – unit costs: the costs of general practice / psychiatry and related services</li> <li>Frequency data: additional numbers of visits needed and estimates of use of emergency and hospitalisation services because of intimate partner violence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit costs: estimates based on data from the French National Health Insurance Fund for Salaried Workers and National Audit Office data</li> <li>Frequency data: official data on people using healthcare services (for service sector costs) plus survey data on additional healthcare visits needed and use of emergency and hospitalisation services because of intimate partner violence (victim costs)</li> </ul>
Néréa et al. (2018)	Service sector costs: access system for psycho-trauma care, using a global and specialised approach, and costs of mandatory training for healthcare staff	Bottom-up: unit costs of healthcare services multiplied by the number of users (victims in need of the service or health professionals in need of training)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit costs: psycho-trauma care costs or costs of one training session</li> <li>Victim-based data: number of women accessing psycho-trauma care services or number of healthcare staff attending training</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit costs: costs of care based on the Maison des femmes de Saint-Denis model or the authors' calculations</li> <li>Victim-based data: numbers of victims based on the experiences of specialised service associations or French Ministry of Health data</li> </ul>
EPRS (2021)	Service sector costs: health service costs (prevention, diagnosis and treatment) related to dealing with the physical and emotional harms of crime	Bottom-up: unit costs multiplied by prevalence data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit costs: average health service costs of all injuries suffered</li> <li>Prevalence: rates of gender-based cyberviolence and regression-based estimates of prevalence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit cost: extracted per Member State from Gustavsson et al. (2011)</li> <li>Prevalence: European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights 2012 and 2019 surveys, existing literature and regression-based predictions</li> </ul>
Alcon et al. (2019)	Service sector costs: public (national) health service costs related to dealing with the physical and emotional harms of crime	Bottom-up: unit costs of health services multiplied by the estimated numbers of times victims seek assistance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit costs for first aid, urgent treatments, psychotherapy and drug treatments</li> <li>Multiplier: likelihood of needing medical assistance</li> <li>Frequency data: number of times victims seek assistance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit costs: Zhang et al. (2012)</li> <li>Frequency data and multiplier: Macroencuesta de la Violencia contra la Mujer (2015) de la Delegación del Gobierno para la Violencia de Género (2015 Survey on Violence against Women)</li> </ul>

### 3.3.3. Legal costs

The legal costs associated with gender-based and intimate partner violence can be divided into two categories: criminal justice system costs and civil justice system costs. The criminal justice system deals with the prosecution of crimes associated with gender-based violence and data from court cases are relatively widely available. Disaggregated data on the portion of

civil justice service costs that are attributable to gender-based violence are less widely available and, hence, these costs are more difficult to quantify. These costs are mostly associated with divorce and related proceedings (such as financial matters and child custody) and child welfare cases (where intimate partner violence co-occurs with child abuse). Table 18 provides a comparison of the methodologies used in the studies reviewed to estimate legal costs.

**Table 18. Comparison of methodologies used to estimate legal costs**

Author and year	Types of costs and actors bearing the costs	Methodology used	Elements needed to estimate costs	Types of data source used
EIGE (2021)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Service sector costs: criminal justice system (prosecution, magistrates, crown courts and police), civil justice system (legally aided civil justice family law)</li> <li>Victim costs: civil justice system (divorce and related proceedings related to intimate partner violence)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bottom-up: unit costs of criminal justice system multiplied by incidence of gender-based violence and intimate partner violence</li> <li>Top-down: budget data for civil justice proceedings multiplied by the estimated proportion attributable to intimate partner violence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit costs: criminal justice system unit cost, cost of divorce and related proceedings, local authority expenditure on police</li> <li>Prevalence: incidence data for gender-based violence, intimate partner violence (criminal justice), number of civil justice proceedings, number of legally aided family law proceedings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit costs: Home Office (2018) criminal justice system unit costs, MacLean (1998) for the costs of divorce, MHCLG local authority expenditure data, legal aid statistics</li> <li>Prevalence: CSEW, ONS divorce statistics, legal aid statistics, family court statistics</li> <li>Multipliers: Walby (2004)</li> </ul>
Oliver et al. (2019)	Service costs: criminal justice system, police costs, civil legal system (private and public family proceedings), multi-agency risk assessment conferences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Top-down (civil justice and criminal justice): total budget data multiplied by proportion of domestic abuse-specific cases</li> <li>Bottom-up: police costs multiplied by number of hours spent on cases</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit costs: costs of healthcare activities</li> <li>Multiplier: likelihood of suffering injuries (or number of counselling sessions required per type of harm)</li> <li>Incidence data: prevalence data combined with co-occurrence of different types of abuse for the same victim</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit costs: cost of healthcare activities obtained from Curtis and Burns (2016) and NHS reference costs (2017).</li> <li>Multiplier: likelihood of requiring health services: CSEW</li> <li>Incidence: prevalence data and co-occurrence of different types of abuse from the CSEW domestic abuse module</li> </ul>
Walby et al. (2020)	Criminal justice system (police, courts)	Bottom-up: number of days the relevant criminal justice system professionals spent on a case multiplied by the cost per day for criminal justice system cases	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit costs: estimates of the costs of the criminal justice system for human trafficking multiplied by the number of cases of human trafficking and related issues processed by the police, prosecutors and courts</li> <li>Prevalence: aggregated data</li> </ul>	Unit costs: cost estimates per day and number of cases or time spent provided by the national rapporteurs and equivalent mechanisms questionnaires in each EU Member State

Author and year	Types of costs and actors bearing the costs	Methodology used	Elements needed to estimate costs	Types of data source used
Cavalin et al. (2015)	Service sector costs: civil justice system costs attributable to intimate partner violence, criminal justice system costs attributable to intimate partner violence, prison administration costs attributable to intimate partner violence	Bottom-up: unit costs of the relevant legal service (civil justice court cases, criminal justice court cases, prison administration and police) multiplied by the corresponding frequency data (average cost of court cases, number of prison months, number of crimes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit costs: average cost of a divorce (civil justice system), average cost of a sanctioned offence, average cost of a prisoner, police costs (criminal justice system)</li> <li>Frequency data: number of divorces attributable to intimate partner violence (civil justice system), number of court cases, prison time, number of incidents of intimate partner violence recorded by the police</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit costs: <i>Statistical Yearbook of Justice</i> (civil justice), budget data from the French Ministry of Justice, prison administration data (Directorate of Prison Administration), National Observatory of Crime and Criminal Justice (criminal justice)</li> <li>Frequency data: draft budget bill, divorce data and prison time from the Ministry of Justice ('Exploitation statistique du Casier judiciaire national')</li> <li>Multiplier (for civil justice): percentage of divorces attributable to intimate partner violence (based on private conversations with lawyers)</li> </ul>
Néréa et al. (2018)	Service sector: criminal justice system costs (mandatory training for legal professionals and police officers, police/gendarmerie social worker costs), civil justice system costs	Bottom-up: unit cost of training course multiplied by the number of professionals undertaking the course and unit cost of social worker's salary multiplied by the number of social workers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit costs: cost of one training session plus cost of replacing professionals during their absence, social worker's average salary</li> <li>Frequency data: number of professionals needed to train, number of social workers needed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit costs for training sessions and social worker's salary from authors' calculations</li> <li>Frequency data: French Ministry of Justice</li> </ul>
EPRS (2021)	Service sector costs: costs of legal proceedings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bottom-up: prevalence of gender-based cyber-violence multiplied by an estimate of the number pressing charges and the unit legal costs</li> <li>Prevalence: rates of gender-based cyber-violence and regression analysis</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit costs: cost of legal proceedings per Member State (family and commercial law)</li> <li>Multipliers: percentage pressing charges</li> <li>Prevalence: rates of gender-based cyber-violence and regression-based estimates of prevalence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit costs: European Commission 2008 (HOCHT and DG Justice and Consumers, 2007)</li> <li>Multiplier: assumption</li> <li>Prevalence: European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights 2012 and 2019 surveys, existing literature and regression-based predictions</li> </ul>
Alcon et al. (2019)	Service sector costs: costs of legal proceedings	Top-down: total public sector legal costs multiplied by the percentage of gender-based violence cases	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit costs: total costs of legal services in the public sector</li> <li>Multiplier: percentage of gender-based violence cases</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit costs of legal services from official budget documents</li> <li>Percentage of gender-based violence cases from official Spanish registers</li> </ul>

**Most of the legal costs associated with gender-based violence concern service sector costs, especially for criminal justice system cases.** Legally aided civil justice family law proceedings are also included in service sector costs. **However, legal aid for private civil justice proceedings may not be available or accessible to all victims of intimate partner violence, who have to cover the costs using private means.** Data on the costs of private civil legal proceedings are mostly unavailable. For this reason, some studies (EIGE, 2021; Oliver et al., 2019) attempted to estimate victim costs for self-funded legal proceedings using unit cost estimates derived from legally aided costs. As discussed in Alcon et al. (2019), the time spent in court should also be considered when calculating costs. In their study, the authors included an estimate of the time spent in court for criminal and civil proceedings in the lost output calculations. However, this approach was not followed in all studies, which may have led to an underestimation of costs.

The method used to estimate legal costs varied across the studies. In general, **the prevailing methodology for estimating criminal justice system costs used a bottom-up approach.** In these cases, the unit costs for courts, prosecutions and magistrates were multiplied by either

the number of proceedings or the amount of time (hours or days) spent in court.

**Methodologies for estimating the civil justice system costs associated with gender-based violence varied – top-down approaches were more common.** In most cases, the number of family law proceedings was used to obtain expenditure data for cases relevant to gender-based violence. The methodology used to estimate the number of civil law proceedings attributable to intimate-partner violence varied. Some studies (Cavalin et al., 2015; EIGE, 2021; EPRS 2021) used a multiplier consisting of the estimated number of divorces caused by intimate partner violence based on existing research or administrative data.

### 3.3.4. Other monetisable costs

There are other monetisable costs that occur because of gender-based violence. These include the costs of public services to assist victims, in terms of both housing and other specialised services, and costs that co-occur with gender-based violence, such as public expenditure on child welfare. Table 19 provides a comparison of the methodologies used in the studies reviewed to estimate other monetisable costs.

**Table 19. Comparison of methodologies used to estimate other monetisable costs**

Author and year	Types of costs and actors bearing the costs	Methodology used	Elements needed to estimate costs	Types of data source used
EIGE (2021)	Service sector costs: housing aid costs	Top-down: local authority expenditure on homelessness prevention and relief multiplied by the reported percentage of households due housing aid because of domestic violence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Budget data: local authority expenditure on homelessness prevention and relief</li> <li>Multiplier: proportion of beneficiaries of prevention or relief funds that are homeless because of intimate partner violence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Budget data: MHCLG expenditure</li> <li>Multiplier: MHCLG live homelessness tables</li> </ul>
EIGE (2021)	Victim costs: costs of moving home	Top-down: estimate of the total cost incurred by divorced individuals for moving home multiplied by the estimated percentage of couples who have divorced because of intimate partner violence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Budget data: average cost of setting up a new home after divorce</li> <li>Multiplier: proportion of divorces attributable to intimate partner violence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Budget data: Aviva surveys (2006, 2014 and 2018)</li> <li>Multiplier: Walby (2006)</li> </ul>

Author and year	Types of costs and actors bearing the costs	Methodology used	Elements needed to estimate costs	Types of data source used
EIGE (2021)	Costs to the economy: specialist service costs	Top-down: government expenditure data and budget data from specialist service organisations were used to estimate costs	Budget data from specialist service sources	Variety of sources
Oliver et al. (2019)	Service sector costs: housing costs (temporary housing, homelessness aid and maintenance and repairs)	Top-down: expenditure data on housing (temporary housing, homelessness aid and maintenance and repair) multiplied by the estimated proportion of beneficiaries who are victims of intimate partner violence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Budget data: expenditure on temporary housing, homelessness aid and maintenance and repair</li> <li>Multipliers: percentages of beneficiaries of temporary accommodation, homelessness aid and maintenance and repair services who are victims of intimate partner violence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Budget data: MHCLG (England) and Welsh government data (housing and homelessness)</li> <li>Multipliers: MHCLG (2017), SafeLives and Gentoo (maintenance and repair)</li> </ul>
Oliver et al. (2019)	Costs to society / the economy: victim services (charity expenditure, domestic abuse practitioners, independent domestic violence advocates, government support costs)	Top-down: budget and expenditure data from specialised services were used to derive part of the costs of victim services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Budget data: expenditure on specialised services</li> <li>Multiplier: FTE data for service employees</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Budget information from charities, average salaries from ONS, SafeLives' domestic abuse practitioners survey</li> <li>FTE data: information from charities and SafeLives' domestic abuse practitioners survey</li> </ul>
Walby et al. (2020)	Criminal justice system costs (police and court costs)	Bottom-up: detailed costs for units of activity, which were then aggregated	Unit costs: cost per day multiplied by the number of days used per trafficking case by the police, by prosecutors and by courts	Unit costs: cost estimate data per day provided by questionnaire responses from rapporteurs and equivalent mechanisms
Cavalin et al. (2015)	Service sector costs: costs of supporting victims and prevention services for perpetrators of intimate partner violence	Top-down: the budget provided by the state to which the support provided by departments and regions is added	Unit costs: state budget: national subsidies for receiving and supporting victims (including subsidies for diverse associations, e.g. CNIDFF and FNSF); departmental and regional budget: budget for local actions	Unit costs: state budget from ministerial plan for fighting against violence against women; departmental and regional budget: authors' calculations

Author and year	Types of costs and actors bearing the costs	Methodology used	Elements needed to estimate costs	Types of data source used
Cavalin et al. (2015)	Service sector costs: costs of housing assistance provided to victims of intimate partner violence (refuge spaces and housing aid)	Bottom-up: unit cost of refuge space per year or housing subsidies multiplied by the number of people who will use these services because of intimate partner violence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit costs: average cost per space per year (refuges), average cost of housing subsidies (housing assistance)</li> <li>Frequency data: number of refuge spaces available, number of people having divorced because of intimate partner violence (considering only couples with children)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit costs: cost of refuge units obtained from the DGCS; housing assistance data computed using National Fund for Family Allowances data</li> <li>Frequency data: available housing spaces from a survey carried out by the DGCS in 2013; number of people seeking housing aid because of intimate partner violence from French Ministry of Justice data and Insee data</li> </ul>
Cavalin et al. (2015)	Service sector costs: costs of family support allowance and active solidarity income for victims in connection with divorces attributable to intimate partner violence	Bottom-up: number of divorces attributable to intimate partner violence multiplied by the percentage of intimate partner violence victims who will need support multiplied by the average amount of family support allowance given to each family or amount of active solidarity income	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit costs: average family support allowance, average active solidarity income</li> <li>Multipliers: number of divorces attributable to intimate partner violence and proportion of victims who will need support services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit costs: National Office for Family Allocations</li> <li>Multipliers: number of divorces obtained from 'key data from Justice 2013' and percentage of intimate partner violence victims estimated from conversations with lawyers; percentage of intimate partner violence victims who need services obtained from Insee data</li> </ul>
Cavalin et al. (2015)	Service sector costs: child welfare support costs attributable to intimate partner violence	Top-down: total budget for child welfare multiplied by the percentage of children who are ASE (child welfare) beneficiaries as a result of intimate partner violence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Budget data: total budget for child welfare (ASE) in 2012</li> <li>Multiplier: percentage of children who are ASE beneficiaries as a result of intimate partner violence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Total budget for child welfare: Insee data</li> <li>Multiplier: estimate based on seven different studies</li> </ul>
Néréa et al. (2018)	Service sector costs: costs of supporting victims, e.g. provision of information, listening, orienting and supporting during the judicial process, vocational reintegration and coordination	Bottom-up: unit cost of service multiplied by the number of victims who will need this support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit cost: cost of providing support</li> <li>Victim-based data: number of victims who will need this support (recourse rate multiplied by number of victims)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit cost: estimated from interviews</li> <li>Victim-based data: recourse rate estimated from interviews and the number of victims obtained from data from the French government (<a href="https://arretonslesviolences.gouv.fr">https://arretonslesviolences.gouv.fr</a>) and Insee surveys (2012–2017)</li> </ul>

Author and year	Types of costs and actors bearing the costs	Methodology used	Elements needed to estimate costs	Types of data source used
Néréa et al. (2018)	Service sector costs: costs of housing women in dedicated and specialised centres	Bottom-up: unit cost of service multiplied by the number of victims who will need this support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit cost: costs of housing</li> <li>Victim-based data: number of victims who will need this support (recourse rate multiplied by number of victims)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit cost: existing research by Cavalin et al. (2015)</li> <li>Victim-based data: recourse rate estimated based on the experiences of specialised associations (percentage of victims who need support and amount of time they will need to be housed for)</li> </ul>
Néréa et al. (2018)	State costs: costs of researching or developing new innovative policies to help fight against violence against women	Top-down: 10 % of the proposed total budget	Top-down approach: 10 % of the proposed total budget	Authors' calculations
Néréa et al. (2018)	Other support service costs ('serious danger' phones, 24/7 telephone assistance, annual awareness-raising campaign)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other: costs for telephone support and awareness-raising campaigns are from another source</li> <li>Bottom-up: unit cost of a 'serious danger' phone multiplied by the number of phones distributed</li> </ul>	Top-down approach: state budget: national subsidies for receiving and supporting victims (including subsidies for diverse associations, e.g. CNIDFF and FNSF); departmental and regional budget: budget for local actions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other: other sources</li> <li>Bottom-up: state budget: data obtained from ministerial plan for fighting against violence against women; departmental and regional budget: authors' calculations</li> </ul>
Alcon et al. (2019)	Victim costs: costs of moving home (changing neighbourhood/city and possibly employment)	Bottom-up: number of victims relocating multiplied by the average cost of relocating	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit costs: average cost of relocation assuming a move to a two-bedroom flat within the same city</li> <li>Victim-based data: number of women (and children) relocating</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit costs: methodology based on Zhang et al. (2012)</li> <li>Number of women relocating: Macroencuesta de la Violencia contra la Mujer (2015) de la Delegación del Gobierno para la Violencia de Género (2015 Survey on Violence against Women)</li> </ul>
Alcon et al. (2019)	Service sector costs: costs of providing basic assistance, telephone services for information and emergencies, and specialised units	Costs of specialist services that provide assistance to women victims of gender-based violence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Budget data from a selected number of specialist services</li> <li>Victim-based data: number of women who contact specialist services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Budget data from annual expenditure reports of relevant organisations (where available)</li> <li>Victim-based data: Macroencuesta de la Violencia contra la Mujer (2015) de la Delegación del Gobierno para la Violencia de Género (2015 Survey on Violence against Women)</li> </ul>

NB: ASE, Aide Sociale a l'enfance; CNIDFF, Centre national d'information sur les droits des femmes et des familles; DGCS, Directorate General for Social Cohesion; FNSF, Fédération nationale solidarité femmes; FTE, full-time equivalent; Insee, National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies.

The majority of the cost types included in this category relate to service sector costs for housing aid and child welfare. It is difficult to quantify some of these costs because of the variety of services and specialised organisations available at both local and national levels and the lack of reliable data associated with them. The majority of the studies reviewed relied on the top-down approach, using expenditure data on housing, child welfare and specialist services. The method used to estimate the proportion of these costs attributable to gender-based violence varied. Because of the unavailability of disaggregated data on the proportion of expenditure associated with gender-based violence, most studies relied on assumptions (based on common knowledge) on the use of these services by victims of gender-based violence. Data on housing are more comprehensive and often include calculations on the proportion of housing beneficiaries in need of support because of domestic violence, available from administrative

data. Similarly, in most cases, expenditure on specialist services is almost entirely attributable to gender-based violence given the specificity of the services provided. As such, no assumptions about users were needed for the cost estimations. However, data on specialist services are dispersed and incomplete because of the variety of these services across countries and the lack of details in the administrative data in some non-profit organisations.

### 3.3.5. Other non-monetisable costs

An important proportion of the costs associated with gender-based violence is non-monetisable. This includes the longer-term physical and emotional impacts on the quality of life of victims and the loss of human life as a consequence of gender-based violence. Table 20 summarises the methodologies used in the studies reviewed to calculate non-monetisable costs.

**Table 20. Comparison of methodologies used to estimate other non-monetisable costs**

Author and year	Types of costs and actors bearing the costs	Methodology used	Elements needed to estimate costs	Types of data source used
EIGE (2021)	Victim costs: physical and emotional impacts on victims – reduction in the quality of life of victims from the physical and emotional harms suffered as a result of the crime	Bottom-up: the unit cost of the physical and emotional impacts multiplied by the incidence of gender-based violence and intimate partner violence in the United Kingdom for different crime categories	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit cost: negative percentage impact on a person's quality of life (QALY loss) from different injuries multiplied by the duration of harm for different injuries</li> <li>Incidence data: number of incidents of gender-based and intimate partner violence in the United Kingdom</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit cost: existing 2018 Home Office research on the economic and social costs of crime</li> <li>Incidence data: estimated from 2019/2020 CSEW data and 2019 ONS data</li> </ul>
Oliver et al. (2019)	Victim costs: physical and emotional impacts on victims – reduction in the quality of life of victims from the physical and emotional harms suffered as a result of the crime	Bottom-up: QALY approach, using the statistical value of 1 year of life without disability discounted by the disability weights by injury multiplied by the likelihood of experiencing physical and emotional harms as a result of domestic abuse	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit cost: statistical value of 1 year of life</li> <li>Multipliers: likelihood of physical and emotional harms as a result of domestic abuse, disability weights and duration</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit cost: <i>The Green Book</i> (HM Treasury, 2012)</li> <li>Multiplier: likelihood of physical or emotional injury as a result of intimate partner violence from the CSEW, Heeks et al. (2018) and Acquadro Maran and Veretto (2018)</li> <li>Incidence: ONS (2018a-g); duration: SafeLives (2018)</li> </ul>

Author and year	Types of costs and actors bearing the costs	Methodology used	Elements needed to estimate costs	Types of data source used
Walby et al. (2020)	Victim costs: loss of quality of life as a result of the physical, sexual and mental injuries caused by human trafficking	Bottom-up: health-oriented framework of the Global Burden of Disease study, in which disability weights are used to estimate the impact on QALYs both during trafficking and post trafficking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unit cost: value of 1 year of life without disability</li> <li>• Prevalence: likelihood of injury/harm by type of violence</li> <li>• Multipliers: disability weights and duration</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unit cost: benchmark for the statistical value of human life (European Commission, 2009)</li> <li>• Prevalence of physical injuries from the CSEW and mental harms from the Protect study (Oram et al., 2016)</li> <li>• Multiplier: disability weights from the Global Burden of Disease study and duration from Reed et al. (2018) for physical injuries and from the Adult Psychiatric Morbidity Survey for mental health harms</li> </ul>
Cavalin et al. (2015)	Costs to society / the economy: loss of human capital because of deaths linked to intimate partner violence (victims, perpetrators and children)	Bottom-up: number of deaths linked to intimate partner violence multiplied by the statistical value of human life	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unit cost: statistical value of human life (EUR 3 million)</li> <li>• Incidence data: number of deaths linked to intimate partner violence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unit cost: official report by Quinet and Baumstark (2013)</li> <li>• Incidence data: report by the Délégation aux victimes</li> </ul>
Cavalin et al. (2015)	Victim costs: cost of rapes in relation to intimate partner violence	Bottom-up: estimated number of rapes multiplied by the cost of the harm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unit cost: cost of the harm</li> <li>• Incidence data: number of rapes related to intimate partner violence reported to the police/gendarmerie</li> <li>• Multiplier: factor for victims who lodge a complaint (1 in 10) to take into account rapes that are not reported</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unit cost: computations based on Quinet and Baumstark (2013)</li> <li>• Incidence data: number of reported rapes from the National Observatory of Crime and Criminal Justice</li> <li>• Multiplier: obtained from the Collectif féministe contre le viol</li> </ul>
Ornstein (2017)	Victim/society losses: loss of human life	Econometric approach: propensity score matching used to estimate percentage increase in mortality after an increase in assault, which was then multiplied by the value of statistical life	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effects of assault on mortality: estimated yearly increase in mortality for women and men</li> <li>• Multiplier: value of statistical life</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effects of assault on mortality: based on regression model</li> <li>• Multiplier: value of statistical life calculated by the Swedish Transport Administration</li> </ul>
EPRS (2021)	Victim costs: reduced quality of life	Bottom-up: (QALY) value of 1 year of healthy life discounted by disability weights multiplied by rates of gender-based cyber-violence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unit cost: value of a healthy life-year – same value estimated across Member States</li> <li>• Multiplier: loss of healthy life-years because of disability</li> <li>• Prevalence: rates of gender-based cyber-violence and regression-based estimates of prevalence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Value of a healthy life-year: European Commission (2020)</li> <li>• Loss of healthy life-years because of disability: Global Burden of Disease study</li> </ul>

Author and year	Types of costs and actors bearing the costs	Methodology used	Elements needed to estimate costs	Types of data source used
Alcon et al. (2019)	Victim costs: loss of quality of life as a result of violence	Bottom-up: estimated prevalence multiplied by the costs of either anxiety or depression in terms of quality of life	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit cost: value of a healthy life-year, impact of gender-based violence on a healthy life-year, disability weights</li> <li>Prevalence of gender-based violence by injury</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prevalence of gender-based violence by injury: Dolan et al. (2005) and Macroencuesta de la Violencia contra la Mujer (2015) de la Delegación del Gobierno para la Violencia de Género (2015 Survey on Violence against Women)</li> <li>Value of a healthy life-year: Dolan et al. (2005, pp. 964–966) and Dubourg et al. (2005)</li> </ul>

NB: QALY, quality-adjusted life-year.

### All except one study relied on a bottom-up approach to estimate the loss of quality of life as a consequence of gender-based violence.

This approach consisted of using a benchmark for the statistical value of 1 year of human life without disability as the unit cost, which was discounted by the physical or emotional harms to which victims were subjected. Each of the harms was associated with a disability weight (from the Global Burden of Disease study). The method used to estimate the likelihood of victims incurring these harms varied across studies. Only two studies (Cavalin et al., 2015; Ornstein, 2017) included the cost to society of the loss of life from gender-based violence. In the case of Cavalin et al. (2015), this cost included the loss of life of perpetrators who take their own life, in addition to the loss of life of victims (including children).

## 3.4. Strengths and limitations of the selected studies

As shown in the previous section, recent studies estimating the cost of gender-based violence considered a range of costs for different agents (individuals, society/economy). Studies measured costs to the economy that are directly attributable to gender-based violence, such as the costs of housing aid and specialised services for victims of gender-based violence, as well as costs to the healthcare and legal sectors; extensive survey and administrative data are

required to measure these latter costs incurred as a result of gender-based violence. The study by EPRS (2021) also provides the only recent estimate of the cost of gender-based cyberviolence in the EU, which is a growing phenomenon of concern in the EU and worldwide.

**A key strength of the studies reviewed is that they provide a range of estimates, such as low and high scenarios (Cavalin et al., 2015; Néréa et al., 2018) and most conservative and least conservative (Alcon et al., 2018), rather than point estimates.** This acknowledges that costing studies cannot capture the exact costs of violence and provides transparency about the degree of uncertainty around point estimates. Specifically, the study by Cavalin et al. (2015) used high and low estimates of prevalence rates of intimate partner violence, the percentage of people who use emergency services as a result of intimate partner violence, the percentage of divorces attributable to intimate partner violence and the percentage of children who are beneficiaries of child welfare. Similarly, Néréa et al. (2018) used a low scenario for costs based on police-recorded data (incidence) and a high scenario for costs based on a survey of victims (prevalence). Furthermore, Alcon et al. (2019) provided a range of potential costs by calculating different estimates for the same type of costs from different data sources. For lost output costs, healthcare costs and legal costs, the study used two different cost estimates from Zhang et al. (2012) and the first edition (2005)

of the Home Office report. Separate estimates were also calculated based on the agents considered: victims of sexual or physical violence resulting in injury; women victims of sexual or physical violence; women victims of any type of violence; and all victims of any type of physical or sexual violence. A range of potential costs gives greater credibility to the estimates.

**An additional strength observed in the selected studies is that they considered the longer-term impact of violence on victims after the incidence of the violence.**

In addition to short-term physical impacts of gender-based violence, victims may suffer long-term physical and emotional impacts. The study by Néréa et al. (2018) focused on estimating the costs of supporting women who leave violent relationships. Hence, the study calculated the costs of funding specialised services such as information, health and social services, emergency accommodation and judicial services including the costs of increasing the public budgets for women's NGOs that specialise in supporting survivors who wish to exit relationships. Furthermore, the study by Ornstein (2017), which is the only study that followed an econometric approach, measured the longer-term/future costs of violence in terms of loss of life and lost earnings for victims in the period after the violent incident.

However, there are **several methodological limitations to estimating the costs of gender-based violence**. First, as shown by the comparison of methodologies above, the impact of gender-based violence on different agents cannot be fully measured. For the calculation of lost economic output, for example, only two studies (Alcon et al., 2019; EPRS, 2021) separately considered the economic impact of gender-based violence on employers and the economy. Similarly, for healthcare costs, only one study (Cavalin et al., 2015) considered costs incurred by victims for services that are not provided by public healthcare. For civil legal costs, Cavalin et al. (2015) and the present case study are the only studies to calculate the costs of divorce attributable to intimate partner violence that are borne by the victim. Second, the impact of gender-based violence across different types

of costs to the victim and the economy cannot be fully measured. For example, disentangling the extent to which poor mental health can be attributed to gender-based violence rather than other factors is difficult (EIGE, 2014). Furthermore, the types of agents for whom costs are measured depend on the visible costs to the economy or the individual. In other words, costs for legal, housing, child welfare or specialised services may not include costs to individual victims who bear costs privately and do not seek assistance.

Moreover, the robustness of the estimated costs depends on data availability and quality. As shown in Section 2.2, costing studies require extensive administrative data on the costs and use of services. When these data are not available, alternative estimation techniques are used instead, but they yield less robust estimates. Because of the limited administrative data available, Néréa et al. (2018) estimated the proportions of victims who will use psychological trauma care, victims eligible for legal aid and victims who will need housing support through communication with relevant associations. To estimate the proportion of divorces attributable to intimate partner violence, Cavalin et al. (2015) relied on communication with lawyers. Similarly, Cavalin et al. (2015) obtained estimates of the percentage of children who are beneficiaries of child welfare as a result of intimate partner violence based on an assessment of seven different studies. Furthermore, in accordance with EIGE's 2014 methodology, the present UK case study relies on estimates from previous literature on the proportion of police time spent on intimate partner violence cases, the proportion of divorces attributable to intimate partner violence and the rate of co-occurrence between child abuse and domestic violence. Hence, the calculated cost estimates depend on the assumptions and data sources used.

### 3.5. Reflections and lessons learned

This section presents the reflections and lessons learned from the in-depth assessment of the seven studies selected. It first considers the

main components of costing studies at Member State level. It then considers studies conducted at EU level to reflect on the methodology used in the present study and studies identified in the literature review.

### 3.5.1. Estimating the costs of gender-based violence at Member State level


The majority of the selected studies followed either a bottom-up or a top-down approach to calculate the costs of violence related to lost economic output, healthcare and legal services and other monetisable and non-monetisable impacts. Both the top-down and the bottom-up approaches account for different types of costs generated for different actors, which can include individuals (victims, relatives, employers, perpetrators) or the economy / society. Figure 1 summarises the main components of the two methodologies used in the selected studies.

**The first step in both approaches is to make a decision about the types of costs to measure and the agents bearing the costs.** As shown in Section 3.3, studies often use a combination of costs to the individual and costs to society to estimate the total costs of gender-based violence.

**For the bottom-up approach, key components are data on unit costs (step 2) and the prevalence or incidence of gender-based violence in a Member State (step 3).** The latter component was essential for estimating most types of costs in the selected studies as it estimates the extent of gender-based violence in a country. The selected country-level studies relied on national crime surveys on domestic abuse (Oliver et al., 2019), violence against women surveys that provide information on the relationship to the perpetrator (Alcon et al., 2019; Cavalin et al., 2015; Néréa et al., 2018) or police records of crimes committed by a partner or ex-partner (Néréa et al., 2018). In terms of unit costs, some of the studies reviewed used estimates obtained from existing research by Heeks et al. (2018), a European Commission (2018) report, Gustavsson et al. (2011), MacLean (1998) and Zhang et al. (2012). The advantage of using existing research to estimate unit costs is

that it does not require authors to carry out their own calculations, which require national survey or administrative data. For example, studies that used their own calculations for unit costs relied on survey or administrative data on average salaries, amount of time taken off work, the cost of each type of healthcare activity, insurance costs, prison costs, legal aid costs and more (see Section 3.2 for detailed overview of data sources). However, a key drawback of using unit costs based on existing research is that they may not account for cost differences between the country of focus in the existing research and the Member State for which the costs were calculated. Finally, in the absence of survey or administrative data providing information on the proportion of the costs that can be attributed to gender-based violence, the bottom-up approach may also rely on estimates based on existing research or interviews and questionnaires designed for a particular study (step 4).

**For the top-down approach, key components are data on total government expenditure or budget allocations for the public sector (step 2) and estimates of the proportion of these costs that can be attributed to gender-based violence (step 3).** Some examples of the type of data used in the selected studies include the total costs of legal services to the public sector in Spain (Alcon et al., 2019), local authority expenditure on housing services in the United Kingdom (Oliver et al., 2019) and total budgets for child welfare, ministerial action plans for fighting violence against women and specialist services for victims of gender-based violence in France (Cavalin et al., 2015). Similarly, the present study also used the following types of data: local authority expenditure on the police, data on the costs of moving home as a result of divorce, local authority expenditure on homelessness services and budgets provided to specialist services to support victims of gender-based violence in the United Kingdom. In some cases, the costs incurred because of gender-based violence can be directly identified, such as costs to specialist services or budgets allocated to actions plans that are specifically aimed at supporting victims of gender-based violence. In other cases, additional data are needed to calculate the pro-

**Figure 1. Main methodological components of the bottom-up and top-down approaches**

portion of total costs that are attributable to gender-based violence. For example, Alcon et al. (2019) used data from official Spanish registers to determine the percentage of court cases that were related to gender-based violence. Similarly, Oliver et al. (2019) used local authority data on the provision of accommodation because of 'domestic abuse' to determine gender-based violence costs related to housing services. However, in the absence of costs that can be directly attributed to gender-based violence or administrative data that can be used to calculate costs incurred as a result of gender-based violence, estimates are needed from existing research or interviews and questionnaires designed for a particular study.

### 3.5.2. Estimating the costs of gender-based violence at European level

The two studies identified that estimated costs at European level (EPRS, 2021; Walby et al., 2020) followed bottom-up methodologies. Importantly, Walby et al. (2020) did not estimate separate costs for each Member State. In contrast, the EPRS (2021) study estimated separate costs for the Member States and summed these costs to obtain the EU-level estimate.

**An essential component of both EU-level studies was the availability of comparable prevalence data either for the EU as a whole or for each of the Member States.** The study by Walby

et al. (2020) estimated the costs of trafficking in human beings using EU-level prevalence data on the number of victims of trafficking registered in 2016 from a European Commission report (2018). Moreover, in light of the limited comparable prevalence data on gender-based cyberviolence, the study by EPRS (2021) used ‘credible proxies’ and multiple sources of prevalence data in Member States to provide a reliable range for prevalence. Specifically, estimates of gender-based cyberviolence were obtained from the 2012 and 2019 European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights surveys, information collected from single and multi-country studies, and regression-based predictions of the prevalence of cyberviolence in 2019<sup>(24)</sup>. To estimate the different unit costs, Walby et al. (2020) relied on Eurostat data, surveys of EU agencies and national rapporteurs conducted specifically as part of the study, European Commission publications and websites and a review of existing literature. Moreover, the EPRS (2021) study used unit cost estimates from Eurostat, the OECD, existing literature and European Commission publications (see ‘References’ for a detailed overview of the data sources).

**EIGE’s 2014 study and the present update are the only comprehensive studies that have estimated the costs of gender-based and intimate partner violence in each EU-27 Member State and at EU level.** The ideal way to measure these costs would be to use comparable data on the prevalence of gender-based violence and administrative data on the cost and use of services as a result of gender-based violence (for unit costs), harmonised at EU level for each Member State. If calculations use data that are not harmonised at EU level, the differences between Member States would (partly) be due to differences in data systems rather than differences in real costs (EIGE, 2014). In the absence of recent comparable prevalence data and administrative data, the present study (in accordance with the 2014 methodology) measured costs at EU level by extrapolating costs calculated in the UK case study to each of the Member States. The extrapolation

relied on the assumption that the differences in costs in the United Kingdom and across Member States were due to the size of the populations alone. As a result, some important differences between Member States are not reflected in the EU-level estimates for 2019.

- The extrapolation does not consider the potential differences in survey-based prevalence rates across Member States, which means that the cost estimates do not capture if some Member States have a higher or lower prevalence/incidence of gender-based violence than others.
- Reporting rates of gender-based and intimate partner violence may vary significantly between countries depending on awareness of the issue and institutional and cultural barriers to reporting. The extrapolation does not quantify these potential differences in reporting rates.
- The extrapolation does not capture some important differences between countries based on the types, availability and use of services. Public service systems and government expenditure vary across EU Member States depending on factors such as (existing barriers to) utilisation of services and legal duties to provide financial assistance.
- The extrapolation does not consider potential differences between countries in the costs of services utilised by victims of gender-based violence.

To compare studies carried out in EU Member States, comparable data are needed on the prevalence of gender-based violence in the EU. Moreover, the country-level studies assessed as part of the literature review required extensive national administrative and survey data to measure and allocate costs to gender-based violence. Hence, a harmonised approach towards improved administrative data collection is needed.

<sup>(24)</sup> The correlation between cyberharassment/cyberstalking and social media use in 2012 was used to estimate the prevalence of cyberviolence in 2019.

## Recommendations

### 1. Strengthen national and EU data collection on the extent of gender-based violence and costs and use of services as a result of gender-based violence

Robust estimates of the costs of gender-based violence depend on comprehensive data collection on the prevalence or incidence of gender-based violence and on the costs to different agents. Therefore, comprehensive administrative data collection and population surveys at Member State and EU levels will increase the robustness of estimates of the costs of gender-based violence and support evidence-based decision-making. This need has been widely recognised by relevant institutions, including the EU and the Council of Europe and, at international level, the UN, in their commitments to eradicate violence against women. Article 11 of the Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence contains obligations to collect relevant statistical data on all forms of violence covered by the scope of the convention (paragraph 75) and to conduct population-based surveys on the prevalence, nature, determinants and consequences of all forms of violence covered by the scope of the convention (paragraph 78) <sup>(25)</sup>. Relevant statistical data include administrative data collected from public services (health, social welfare, law enforcement and judicial services, etc.), which can provide a basis for estimating the use of services by victims and the administrative costs of gender-based violence <sup>(26)</sup>. Population-based surveys, on the other hand, are essential to assess the severity and frequency of gender-based violence.

### 2. Careful conceptualisation is required prior to conducting a costing study

As highlighted in this review, gender-based violence is a complex problem that can affect the lives of victims, those close to them and society

as a whole both directly and indirectly. Indeed, the full extent of the effects of the violence is rarely captured in most costing studies. To capture the costs associated with gender-based violence, careful conceptualisation to understand the landscape of the agents involved (individuals and organisations) is required, as well as the costs they incur. This review has collated various of these agents, but also highlights that some of these agents and costs are difficult or impossible to capture. Such a conceptualisation helps make explicit what an estimate does and does not capture (potentially in specific Member States) and helps, for example, in conducting sensitivity analyses (recommendation 4).

### 3. Use a range of values or multiple data sources to acknowledge uncertainties in the extent of gender-based violence in a country

All studies that use prevalence or incidence data to measure the extent of gender-based violence underestimate the number of victims or incidents. First, this is because both survey and police data under-report the extent of gender-based violence in a country, the extent of which depends on cultural and institutional factors such as barriers to reporting. Moreover, prevalence data underestimate the extent of gender-based violence because a single person can be a victim more than once. Therefore, using a range of values or different data sources is recommended to acknowledge uncertainties in the extent of gender-based violence in a country. The studies identified in the review acknowledged uncertainties in prevalence or incidence data using the following approaches.

- **Confidence intervals.** Walby et al. (2020) provided confidence intervals <sup>(27)</sup> for the prevalence of different forms of violence in trafficking.
- **Use of both prevalence and incidence data.** Néréa et al. (2018) used a high and low scen-

<sup>(25)</sup> <https://rm.coe.int/16800d383a>

<sup>(26)</sup> <https://rm.coe.int/16800d383a>

<sup>(27)</sup> The confidence interval around a particular value gives an estimated range around the measured value that is likely to include the true (population) value of the parameter (<https://yhec.co.uk/glossary/confidence-interval/>).

ario for the reported number of incidents using police data on the number of incidents and prevalence data on the number of women victims of intimate partner violence.

- **Multiple sources of data.** EPRS (2021) used multiple sources of prevalence data to provide a range of estimates.

#### 4. Conduct a sensitivity analysis to test assumptions

In addition to the collection of prevalence or incidence data, the accounting approach requires a decision to be made about the agents for whom costs are measured (individual, society/economy) and the types of costs to include, which is driven by data availability. Because of data limitations, several studies relied on existing research or communication with relevant agents to estimate the cost of a service and the intensity of service use, that is, the proportion of victims who use a service or the proportion of total costs that can be attributed to gender-based violence. Moreover, choices related to the use of prevalence data compared with incidence data, the agents and types of costs to be included and the data sources to use can lead to differing costs. Therefore, it is recommended that a sensitivity analysis is carried out to assess the robustness of the methodology, that is, to quantify how uncertainties regarding different inputs can impact final cost estimates<sup>(28)</sup>. For example, the following types of inputs can be varied to assess different assumptions made when using bottom-up or top-down methodology.

- **Incidence or prevalence data.** See recommendation 3.
- **Agents for whom costs are measured and the types of costs included.** See recommendation 2. Alcon et al. (2019) calculated three estimates for the different types of costs by varying the group of victims included.

- **Cost of services.** Alcon et al. (2019) used unit costs obtained from two different sources (Dubourg et al. (2005) and Zhang et al. (2012)) to provide different estimates of total costs. Moreover, studies that rely on a review of multiple sources of literature to estimate total costs (e.g. the present study for the costs of moving house) can use the highest and lowest values identified in the literature to quantify the variation.
- **Intensity of service use (i.e. proportion of victims who use services or proportion of total costs that can be attributed to gender-based violence).** Studies that rely on existing literature to estimate service costs incurred as a result of gender-based violence can use the highest and lowest values identified in the literature to quantify the variation.

#### 5. Follow up on existing cost estimates to study the policy implications of gender-based violence

By conducting research that follows up on cost estimates of gender-based violence in a country, the future policy implications of gender-based violence can be considered.

- Assessing the gap between service use and the budget allocated to gender-based violence. Néréa et al. (2018) compared calculations on the overall government budget provided to address the needs of women victims of violence with the estimated cost of supporting exit routes for women who are victims of intimate partner violence. The study found that the existing budget in France is six times lower than the funds needed.
- Developing a macroeconomic model for measuring total output gains or losses to the economy. An Italian study (Ciaschini and Chelli, 2020) used existing cost esti-

<sup>(28)</sup> According to the European Commission's *Better Regulation Guidelines*, a sensitivity analysis is conducted to understand how the uncertainty in the output of a mathematical model or system can be attributed to the different sources of uncertainty in the model inputs (<https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/default/files/better-regulation-guidelines.pdf>).

mates of violence against women and girls in the country from 2013 to implement a macroeconomic input-output approach. The authors added an industry sector to that framework that provides care services to victims of violence against women and girls. This model was then also used to determine the total output gains or losses that emerge from the reallocation of public expenditure from the reduction of violence against women. This approach is quite versatile as different scenarios can easily be estimated, including the total elimination of violence.

- Monitoring the evolution of service provision and extent of gender-based violence to inform future costing studies. The French 2018 yellow paper (République Française, 2020) monitors the evolution of services (e.g. hotline services to help victims of violence) and the evolution of violence using indicators (number of incidents of violence reported to the police), showing current data as well as forecasts. Such indicators can then be used for future planning purposes, for example to determine where service demand corresponds to service provision or to concentrate services in the most exposed police sectors.

# References

## Studies selected for in-depth analysis

Alcon, E. M., Rivera Galicia, L. F., Gallo Rivera, M. T., Montes Pineda, O., Figueroa Navarro, C., Castellano Arroyo, M. and Prieto Sánchez, P. (2019), *El Impacto de la Violencia de Género en España: Una valoración de sus costes en 2016* [*The Impact of Gender-based Violence in Spain: Estimates of its costs for 2016*], Ministry of the Presidency, Relations with the Courts and Equality, Madrid ([https://violenciagenero.igualdad.gob.es/en/violenciaEnCifras/estudios/investigaciones/2019/estudio/Valoracion\\_Costes\\_Violencia.htm](https://violenciagenero.igualdad.gob.es/en/violenciaEnCifras/estudios/investigaciones/2019/estudio/Valoracion_Costes_Violencia.htm)).

Cavalin, C., Albagly, M., Mugnier, C. and Nectoux, M. (2015), *Étude relative à l'actualisation du chiffrage des répercussions économiques des violences au sein du couple et leur incidence sur les enfants en France en 2012: Rapport final de l'étude* [*Study updating the economic quantification of intimate partner violence and its consequences on children in France in 2012: Final report*] Psytel, Paris ([https://www.researchgate.net/publication/295801068\\_Etude\\_relative\\_a\\_l'actualisation\\_du\\_chiffrage\\_des\\_repercussions\\_economiques\\_des\\_violences\\_au\\_sein\\_du\\_couple\\_et\\_leur\\_incidence\\_sur\\_les\\_enfants\\_en\\_France\\_en\\_2012](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/295801068_Etude_relative_a_l'actualisation_du_chiffrage_des_repercussions_economiques_des_violences_au_sein_du_couple_et_leur_incidence_sur_les_enfants_en_France_en_2012)).

EPRS (European Parliamentary Research Service) (2021), *Combating Gender-based Violence: Cyber violence*, European Union, Brussels ([https://www.europarl.europa.eu/thinktank/en/document.html?reference=EPRS\\_STU\(2021\)662621](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/thinktank/en/document.html?reference=EPRS_STU(2021)662621)).

Néréa, C., Auberty, K., Chrétiennot, J., Guiraud, C., Mailfert, A. C., Oderda, M., Vignoud, M., Ronai, E., Baba-Aissa, F., Brisard, M., Duquesne, M., Gaudin, P., Jégou, S., Lê, G., Muracciole, M., Nefesh-Clarke, L. and Toledo, L. (2018), *Où est l'argent contre les violences faites aux femmes?* [*Where is the money for combating violence against women?*], Haut Conseil à l'Égalité entre les femmes et les hommes, Paris (<https://www.haut-conseil-egalite.gouv.fr/violences-de-genre/>

[actualites/article/ou-est-l-argent-contre-les-violences-faites-aux-femmes](https://actualites/article/ou-est-l-argent-contre-les-violences-faites-aux-femmes)).

Oliver, R., Alexander, B., Roe, S. and Wlasny, M. (2019), *The Economic and Social Costs of Domestic Abuse*, Research Report 107, Home Office, London (<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-economic-and-social-costs-of-domestic-abuse>).

Ornstein, P. (2017), 'The price of violence: consequences of violent crime in Sweden', *Working Paper Series*, No 2017:22, Institute for Evaluation of Labour Market and Education Policy, Uppsala, Sweden (<https://www.ifau.se/globalassets/pdf/se/2017/wp2017-22-the-price-of-violence-consequences-of-violent-crime-in-sweden.pdf>).

Walby, S., Bell, P., Bowstead, J., Feder, G., Fraser, A., Herbert, A., Kirby, S., McManus, S., Morris, S., Oram, S., Phoenix, J., Pullerits, M. and Verrall, R. (2020), *Study on the economic, social and human costs of trafficking in human beings within the EU*, European Commission, Brussels ([https://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/sites/antitrafficking/files/study\\_on\\_the\\_economic\\_social\\_and\\_human\\_costs\\_of\\_trafficking\\_in\\_human\\_beings\\_within\\_the\\_eu.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/sites/antitrafficking/files/study_on_the_economic_social_and_human_costs_of_trafficking_in_human_beings_within_the_eu.pdf)).

## Studies considered but not selected for in-depth analysis

Ciaschini, C. and Chelli, F. M. (2020), 'Evaluating the impact of violence against women in the macroeconomic input-output framework', *Economic Systems Research*, Vol. 33, No 2, pp. 214–249 (<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09535314.2020.1790505?journalCode=cesr20>).

Hietamäki, J., Kaipainen, S., Koivula, T., Nipuli, S. and Peltonen, J. (2020), 'Arvio turvakotien perhepaikkojen riittävästä määrästä ja kustannuksista' ['Estimate of needed places for families in shelters and their costs'], *Working Papers*,

- No 44/2020, THL, Helsinki ([https://www.julkari.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/140823/URN\\_ISBN\\_978-952-343-604-6.pdf?sequence=1&is-Allowed=y](https://www.julkari.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/140823/URN_ISBN_978-952-343-604-6.pdf?sequence=1&is-Allowed=y)).
- Sacco, S. (2017), *Häusliche Gewalt Kostenstudie für Deutschland – Gewalt gegen Frauen in (ehemaligen) Partnerschaften* [Cost of domestic violence against women in (ex)partnerships in Germany], Brandenburgische Technische Universität Cottbus-Senftenberg, Germany (<https://www.b-tu.de/news/artikel/13210-kosten-haeuslicher-ge-walt-in-deutschland>).
- Safe Ireland (2021), *Creating Safe Homes and Safe Communities – Supports for domestic violence and coercive control in Budget 2021* (<https://www.safeireland.ie/policy-publications/>).
- Other references and recommended studies**
- Acquadro Maran, D. and Veretto, A. (2018), 'Psychological impact of stalking on male and female health care professional victims of stalking and domestic violence', *Frontiers in Psychology*, Vol. 9 (<https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00321/full>).
- Asante, F., Fenny, A., Dzudzor, M., Chadha, M., Scriver, S., Ballantine, C., Raghavendra, S., Sabir, M., Duvvury, N., Alvarado, G., O'Brien-Milne, L., Mueller, J., Grant-Vest, S., Kennedy, J. and Mensah, W. (2019), *Economic and social costs of violence against women and girls – Ghana – Summary report*, NUI Galway, Galway, Ireland (<https://www.ipsos.com/sites/default/files/ct/publication/documents/2019-07/economic-social-costs-violence-women-girls-ghana-2019.pdf>).
- Ashe, S., Duvvury, N., Raghavendra, S., Scriver, S. and O'Donovan, D. (2017), *Methodological approaches for estimating the economic costs of violence against women and girls*, UK Aid, London (<https://www.whatworks.co.za/documents/publications/90-methodological-approaches-for-estimating-the-economic-costs-of-vawg/file>).
- Badalassi, G., Garreffa, F. and Vingelli, G. (eds) (2013), *Quanto Costa il Silenzio? Indagine nazionale sui costi economici e sociali della violenza contro le donne*, INTERVITA Onlus.
- Baptista, I. and Marlier, E. (2019), *Fighting Homelessness and Housing Exclusion in Europe – A study of national policies*, European Commission, Brussels (<https://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=21629&langId=en>).
- CARE International (2017), *Counting the Cost: The price society pays for violence against women. Report*, CARE International, Geneva ([https://www.care-international.org/files/files/Counting\\_the\\_costofViolence.pdf](https://www.care-international.org/files/files/Counting_the_costofViolence.pdf)).
- Chan, L. K. and Cho, E. Y.-N. (2010), 'A review of cost measures for the economic impact of domestic violence', *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, Vol. 11, No 3, pp. 129–143, doi:10.1177/1524838010374371.
- Commonwealth Secretariat (2019), *The economic cost of violence against women and girls – A study of Seychelles*, Commonwealth Secretariat, London ([https://thecommonwealth.org/sites/default/files/inline/The\\_Economic\\_Cost\\_of\\_Violence\\_Against\\_Women\\_and\\_Girls\\_UPD-F%5B3%5D.pdf](https://thecommonwealth.org/sites/default/files/inline/The_Economic_Cost_of_Violence_Against_Women_and_Girls_UPD-F%5B3%5D.pdf)).
- Commonwealth Secretariat (2020), *The economic cost of violence against women and girls – A study of Lesotho*, Commonwealth Secretariat, London ([https://thecommonwealth.org/sites/default/files/inline/The\\_Economic\\_Cost\\_of\\_Violence\\_Against\\_Women\\_and\\_Girls\\_UPDF%5B3%5D.pdf](https://thecommonwealth.org/sites/default/files/inline/The_Economic_Cost_of_Violence_Against_Women_and_Girls_UPDF%5B3%5D.pdf)).
- Council of Europe (2014), *Overview of studies on the costs of violence against women and domestic violence*, Directorate General of Democracy, Strasbourg (<https://rm.coe.int/168059aa22>).
- Curtis, L. and Burns, A. (2016), *Unit Costs of Health and Social Care 2016*, Personal Social Services Research Unit, University of Kent, Canterbury (<https://www.pssru.ac.uk/pub/uc/uc2016/full.pdf>).
- Department of Health (2017), 'NHS reference costs' (<https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/nhs-reference-costs#published-reference-costs>).
- Déroff, M.-L. (2016), *Parcours de Femmes Victimes de Violences Conjugales* [Stories of women victims of intimate partner violence], Université

- de Bretagne Occidentale, Brest, France (<https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-01253260>).
- Dolan, P., Loomes, G., Peasgood, T. and Tsuchiya, A. (2005), 'Estimating the intangible victim costs of violent crime', *British Journal of Criminology*, Vol. 45, No 6, pp. 958–976.
- Dubourg, R., Hamed, J. and Thorns, J. (2005), *The economic and social costs of crime against individuals and households 2003/04*, Home Office online report 30/05 (<https://library.college.police.uk/docs/hordsolr/rdsolr3005.pdf>).
- EIGE (2014), *Estimating the costs of gender based violence in the European Union: Report*, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg (<https://eige.europa.eu/publications/estimating-costs-gender-based-violence-european-union-report>).
- EIGE (2016), *Administrative Data Collection on Violence against Women – Good practices*, EIGE, Vilnius, Lithuania.
- European Commission (2009), *Annexes to Impact Assessment Guidelines* ([https://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/impact/commission\\_guidelines/docs/iag\\_2009\\_annex\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/impact/commission_guidelines/docs/iag_2009_annex_en.pdf)).
- European Commission (2018), *Data collection on trafficking in human beings in the EU*, European Commission, Brussels ([https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/policies/european-agenda-security/20181204\\_data-collection-study.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/policies/european-agenda-security/20181204_data-collection-study.pdf)).
- European Commission (2020), *Study on the economic, social and human costs of trafficking in human beings within the EU, 2020*, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg.
- European Union Fundamental Rights Agency (2012), 'Survey on violence against women in EU' (<https://fra.europa.eu/en/publications-and-resources/data-and-maps/survey-dataexplorer-violence-against-women-survey?mdq1=dataset>).
- European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (2021), *Your Rights Matter: Police stops – Fundamental rights survey* (<https://fra.europa.eu/en/project/2015/fundamental-rights-survey>).
- Gustavsson, A., Svensson, M., Jacobi, F., Allgulander, C., Alonso, J., Beghi, E., Dodel, R., Ekman, M., Faravelli, C., Fratiglioni, L., Gannon, B., Jones, D. H., Jennum, P., Jordanova, A., Jönsson, L., Karampampa, K., Knapp, M., Kobelt, G., Kurth, T., Lieb, R., Linde, M., Ljungcrantz, C., Maercker, A., Melin, B., Moscarelli, M., Musayev, A., Norwood, F., Preisig, M., Pugliatti, M., Rehm, J., Salvador-Carulla, L., Schlehofer, B., Simon, R., Steinhausen, H. C., Stovner, L. J., Vallat, J. M., Van den Bergh, P., van Os, J., Vos, P., Xu, W., Wittchen, H. U., Jönsson, B., Olesen, J. and CDBE2010 Study Group (2011), 'Cost of disorders of the brain in Europe 2010', *European Neuropsychopharmacology*, Vol. 21, No 10, pp. 718–779, doi:10.1016/j.euroneuro.2011.08.008, erratum in *European Neuropsychopharmacology*, Vol. 22, No 3, 2012, pp. 237–238.
- Heeks, M., Reed, S., Tafsiiri, M. and Prince, S. (2018), *The Economic and Social Costs of Crime – Second edition*, Research report 99, Home Office, London ([https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/732110/the-economic-and-social-costs-of-crime-horr99.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/732110/the-economic-and-social-costs-of-crime-horr99.pdf)).
- HMIC (Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary) (2014), *Everyone's Business: Improving the police response to domestic abuse* (<https://www.justiceinspectors.gov.uk/hmicfrs/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/improving-the-police-response-to-domestic-abuse.pdf>).
- HM Treasury (2012), *The Green Book – Appraisal and evaluation in central government*, HM Treasury, London ([https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20080305121602/http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/media/3/F/green\\_book\\_260907.pdf](https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20080305121602/http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/media/3/F/green_book_260907.pdf)).
- HOCHE and DG Justice and Consumers (2007), *Study on the transparency of costs of civil judicial proceedings in the European Union – Final report* (<https://e-justice.europa.eu/fileDownload.do?id=99bdd781-aa3d-49ed-b9ee-beb7e-b04e3ce>).

- INTERVITA (2013), *How Much Does the Silence Cost? – Summary of the research on the social and economic cost of violence against women in Italy* ([https://eige.europa.eu/resources/a%20Quanto%20costa%20il%20silenzio\\_summary\\_eng\\_new.pdf](https://eige.europa.eu/resources/a%20Quanto%20costa%20il%20silenzio_summary_eng_new.pdf)).
- Kendall, T. (2020), *A synthesis of evidence on the collection and use of administrative data on violence against women*, UN Women, New York.
- KPMG (2016), *The cost of violence against women and their children in Australia – Final report*, Department of Social Services, Australian government ([https://www.dss.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/08\\_2016/the\\_cost\\_of\\_violence\\_against\\_women\\_and\\_their\\_children\\_in\\_australia\\_-\\_summary\\_report\\_may\\_2016.pdf](https://www.dss.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/08_2016/the_cost_of_violence_against_women_and_their_children_in_australia_-_summary_report_may_2016.pdf)).
- López-Sánchez, M. J., Belso-Martínez, J. A. and Hervás-Oliver, J. L. (2019), 'A review of economic consequences and costs of male violence against women', *Indian Journal of Gender Studies*, Vol. 26, No 3, pp. 424–434 (<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0971521519861194?journalCode=ijgb>).
- MacLean, S. (1998), *Report of the Case Profiling Study – Legal aid and the family justice system*, Research Paper 2, Legal Aid Board Research Unit, London.
- McLean, G. and Gonzalez Bocinski, S. (2017), *The economic cost of intimate partner violence, sexual assault, and stalking*, Fact Sheet No B367, Institute for Women's Policy Research, Washington DC.
- MHCLG (Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government) (2017), 'Revenue outturn housing services (RO4) 2016 to 2017' (<https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/local-authority-revenue-expenditure-and-financing-england-2016-to-2017-individual-local-authority-data-outturn>).
- National Center for Injury Prevention and Control (2003), *Costs of intimate partner violence against women in the United States*, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, GA.
- OECD (2017), 'Violence against women: a new policy priority for OECD countries', in *The Pursuit of Gender Equality – An uphill battle*, OECD Publishing, Paris, pp. 83–92.
- OECD (2018), *Health at Glance: Europe 2018 – State of health in the EU cycle*, OECD Publishing, Paris.
- ONS (2018a), 'Domestic abuse: findings from the Crime Survey for England and Wales – appendix tables' (<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/crimeandjustice/datasets/domesticabusefindingsfromthecrimesurveyforenglandandwalesappendixtables>).
- ONS (2018b), 'Domestic abuse: findings from the Crime Survey for England and Wales: year ending March 2017' (<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/crimeandjustice/articles/domesticabusefindingsfromthecrimesurveyforenglandandwales/yearendingmarch2017>).
- ONS (2018c), 'Domestic abuse in England and Wales – appendix tables' (<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/crimeandjustice/datasets/domesticabuseinenglandandwalesappendixtables>).
- ONS (2018d), 'How many types and which types of abuse victims of domestic abuse reported suffering, by sex, year ending March 2015 to year ending March 2017' (<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/crimeandjustice/adhocs/009356howmanytypesandwhichtypesofabusevictimsofdomesticabusereportedssufferingbysexyearendingmarch2015toyearendingmarch2017>).
- ONS (2018e), 'Nature of crime' (<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/crimeandjustice/datasets/natureofcrimeables-violence>).
- ONS (2018f), 'Prevalence of domestic abuse, number of times victims of domestic rape or assault by penetration were victimised and effects of domestic rape or assault by penetration, year ending March 2017' (<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/>

crimeandjustice/adhocs/009359prevalenceof-domesticabusenumeroftimesvictimsofdomes-ticrapeorassaultbypenetrationwerevictimise-dandeffectsofdomesticrapeorassaultbypenetra-tionyearendingmarch2017).

ONS (2018g) 'Sexual offences in England and Wales: year ending March 2017' (<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/crimeandjustice/articles/sexualoffencesineng-landandwales/yearendingmarch2017>).

Oram, S., Abas, M., Bick, D., Boyle, A., Borschmann, R., Dewey, M., Domoney, J., Dimitrova, S., French, R., Geradam, C., Hemmings, S., Howard, L., Jakobowitz, S., Khondoker, M., Broadbent, M., Ottisova, L., Ross, C., Stanley, N., Westwood, J. and Zimmerman, C. (2015), *PROTECT – Provider Responses Treatment and Care for Trafficked People – Final report for the Department of Health policy research programme*, King's College London, London.

Oram, S., Abas, M., Bick, D., Boyle, A., French, R., Jakobowitz, S., Khondoker, M., Stanley, N., Trevillion, K., Howard, L. M. and Zimmerman, C. (2016), 'Human trafficking and health: a survey of male and female survivors in England', *American Journal of Public Health*, Vol. 106, No 6, pp. 1073–1078.

OSCE (2019), *OSCE-led Survey on Violence against Women – Well-being and safety of women – Main report*, OSCE, Vienna.

Psytel (2009), *Estimation du Coût des Violences Conjugales en Europe (IPV EU\_Cost) – Rapport scientifique [Estimation of the cost of intimate partner violence in Europe (IPV EU\_Cost) – Research report]*, Programme DAPHNE II-2006 (<http://www.psytel.eu/PSYTEL/psy-projets/psyviolences-f.php>).

Quinet, É. and Baumstark, L. (2013), *L'évaluation socioéconomique des investissements publics – Rapport final, tome 1 [Socioeconomic Evaluation of Public Investments – Final report, volume 1]*, Commissariat général à la stratégie et à la prospective ([https://www.strategie.gouv.fr/sites/strategie.gouv.fr/files/archives/CGSP\\_Evaluation\\_socioeconomique\\_17092013.pdf](https://www.strategie.gouv.fr/sites/strategie.gouv.fr/files/archives/CGSP_Evaluation_socioeconomique_17092013.pdf)).

Raghavendra, S., Duvvury, N. and Ashe, S. (2017), 'The macroeconomic loss due to violence against women: the case of Vietnam', *Feminist Economics*, Vol. 23, No 4, pp. 62–89 (<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13545701.2017.1330546>).

Rasmussen, I., Strom, S., Sidsel, S. and Vennemo, H. (2012), *Samfunnsøkonomiske kostnader av vold i nære relasjoner [Socioeconomic costs of domestic violence]*, Vista Analyse AS, Oslo ([https://www.vista-analyse.no/site/assets/files/5823/va-rapport\\_2012-41\\_samfunnskononomiske\\_konsekvenser\\_av\\_vold\\_i\\_naere\\_relasjoner.pdf](https://www.vista-analyse.no/site/assets/files/5823/va-rapport_2012-41_samfunnskononomiske_konsekvenser_av_vold_i_naere_relasjoner.pdf)).

Reed, S., Roe, S., Grimshaw, J. and Oliver, R. (2018), *The Economic and Social Costs of Modern Slavery*, Research report 100, Home Office, London ([https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/729836/economic-and-social-costs-of-modern-slavery-horr100.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/729836/economic-and-social-costs-of-modern-slavery-horr100.pdf)).

République Française (2020), *Politique de l'égalité entre les femmes et les hommes* ([https://www.performance-publique.budget.gouv.fr/sites/performance\\_publique/files/farandole/ressources/2020/pap/pdf/DPT/DPT2020\\_egalite\\_femmes\\_hommes.pdf](https://www.performance-publique.budget.gouv.fr/sites/performance_publique/files/farandole/ressources/2020/pap/pdf/DPT/DPT2020_egalite_femmes_hommes.pdf)).

Safe Ireland (2019), 'Needs of women and children living with violence can't wait any longer – Safe Ireland Budget submission', press release (<https://www.safeireland.ie/needs-of-women-and-children-living-with-violence-cant-wait-any-longer-safe-ireland-budget-submission/>).

SafeLives (2018), *SafeLives Insights National Briefing: Length of abuse and access to services* (<https://safelives.org.uk/sites/default/files/resources/SafeLives%20Insights%20National%20Briefing%20Paper%20Abuse%20Length.pdf>)

SafeLives (2019), *Report and financial statements for the year ended 30 June 2019* (<https://safelives.org.uk/sites/default/files/resources/SafeLives%202019%20signed%20Trustee%20report%20and%20financial%20accounts.pdf>).

- UN (2005), *Violence against Women: A statistical overview, challenges and gaps in data collection and methodology and approaches for overcoming them*, Expert Group Meeting, Geneva, Switzerland, 11–14 April.
- UNECE (United Nations Economic and Social Council) (2019), *Trends in Gender Equality in the ECE Region*, UNECE, Geneva.
- UN Women Asia and Pacific (2013), *The Costs of Violence – Understanding the costs of violence against women and girls and its response: Selected findings and lessons learned from Asia and the Pacific*, United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women, Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, Bangkok (<https://asiapacific.unwomen.org/en/digital-library/publications/2014/1/the-costs-of-violence>).
- UN Women Moldova and Women’s Law Center (2016), *Report on costing of domestic violence and violence against women in Moldova*, Women’s Law Center, Chisinau, Moldova (<https://moldova.unwomen.org/en/biblioteca-digitala/publicatii/2016/01/report-on-costing-of-domestic-violence-and-violence-against-women-in-moldova>).
- Walby, S. (2004), *The Costs of Domestic Violence*, Women and Equality Unit, University of Leeds, Leeds.
- Walby, S. (2016), *Ensuring data collection and research on violence against women and domestic violence: Article 11 of the Istanbul Convention*, Council of Europe, Strasbourg.
- Walby, S. and Olive, P. (2013), *European added value of a directive on combatting violence against women Annex II – Economic aspects and legal perspectives for action at EU level*, European Union, Brussels ([http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/etudes/join/2013/504467/IPOL-JOIN\\_ET\(2013\)504467\(ANN02\)\\_EN.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/etudes/join/2013/504467/IPOL-JOIN_ET(2013)504467(ANN02)_EN.pdf)).
- Walker, D. and Duvvury, N. (2016), *Costing the impacts of gender-based violence (GBV) to business: A practical tool*, Overseas Development Institute, London (<https://odi.org/en/publications/costing-the-impacts-of-gender-based-violence-to-business-a-practical-tool/>).
- Women’s Aid Federation of England (2019), *Funding Specialist Support for Domestic Abuse Survivors*, Women’s Aid Federation of England, Bristol (<https://www.womensaid.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/Funding-Specialist-Support-Full-Report.pdf>).
- Zhang, T., Hoddenbagh J., McDonald, S. and Scrim K. (2012), *An estimation of the economic impact of spousal violence in Canada, 2009*, Department of Justice Canada, Ottawa, ON.

## GETTING IN TOUCH WITH THE EU

### IN PERSON

All over the European Union there are hundreds of Europe Direct information centres. You can find the address of the centre nearest you at: [https://europa.eu/european-union/contact\\_en](https://europa.eu/european-union/contact_en)

### ON THE PHONE OR BY EMAIL

Europe Direct is a service that answers your questions about the European Union. You can contact this service:

- by freephone: 00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11 (certain operators may charge for these calls),
- at the following standard number: +32 22999696, or
- by email via: [https://europa.eu/european-union/contact\\_en](https://europa.eu/european-union/contact_en)

## FINDING INFORMATION ABOUT THE EU

### ONLINE

Information about the European Union in all the official languages of the EU is available on the Europa website at: [https://europa.eu/european-union/index\\_en](https://europa.eu/european-union/index_en)

### EU PUBLICATIONS

You can download or order free and priced EU publications from: <https://op.europa.eu/en/publications>. Multiple copies of free publications may be obtained by contacting Europe Direct or your local information centre (see [https://europa.eu/european-union/contact\\_en](https://europa.eu/european-union/contact_en)).

### EU LAW AND RELATED DOCUMENTS

For access to legal information from the EU, including all EU law since 1951 in all the official language versions, go to EUR-Lex at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu>

### OPEN DATA FROM THE EU

The official portal for European data (<https://data.europa.eu/en>) provides access to datasets from the EU. Data can be downloaded and reused for free, for both commercial and non-commercial purposes.



[www.eige.europa.eu](http://www.eige.europa.eu)



Publications Office  
of the European Union